[28th March 1963

SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : Will the Hon. Minister tell us when the estimate was originally sanctioned and what is the amount for which it was sanctioned?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : The original estimate for Rs. 5 lakhs was sanctioned in 1960.

SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : Will the Hon. Minister tell us why there has been this delay of two or three years in the construction of the Guest House which has increased the cost to Rs. 7 lakhs?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : The increase is due not only to the delay but due to some improvements in construction itself. There has not been undue delay.

SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : For what all persons this Guest House is intended?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : For Ministers who go to Delhi on duty, for all Government officers, and also Members of the Legislature.

SRI K. S. ABDUL WAHAB : Has any circular been issued that Members visiting Delhi on official visits can command that facility? Can Members who visit Delhi on private business avail themselves of that facility?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : If I can provide accommodation for people who go on official visit, that itself is a big service. Over and above that, if there is room available, I do not think there will be any difficulty. I shall look into it.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : How many guests can it accommodate at a time?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Thirteen.

SRI K. S. ABDUL WAHAB : What facilities do the Government provide and what is the rate prescribed?

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : It is a comfortable place to stay. As far as the rate is concerned, I am not in a position to say now.

SRI M. RAJAH IYER : Has the hon. Member taken a ticket for Delhi? (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Questions are over.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

II.—DISCUSSION ON THE EDUCATIONAL PATTERN

* THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

"That the Educational Pattern as enunciated in the note placed on the table of the House on the 25th March be taken into consideration"

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

Sir, about this educational pattern, I do not claim that the new pattern of education has been evolved either by me or at my instance. It is not a new pattern of education. We have had many changes in the educational system. Some of us may remember that ever since our student days we have seen so many changes in the educational system. It cannot be argued that there has been no change at all in the educational system. Nor could we state that the past educational system was wholly defective and that it had to be improved. We all know that in ancient times a very good system of education prevailed and our ancestors were quite learned and quite cultured. They had comprehensive knowledge. But still we cannot be satisfied with the knowledge which our ancestors possessed. Kambar and Valluvar were very versatile. They had been foremost among the poets of the world. But still we cannot be satisfied with Valluvar and Kambar. We have to see that our children are equipped in order to meet the present day requirements. We have to take note of rapid advances in the world, particularly in the scientific sphere. We have to train our children in order that they may compete successfully with those of the other parts of the world. Sometimes out of experience we have to introduce certain changes in the system of education. But the House will agree with me that there should not be too frequent changes in the system of education, and that we should try to avoid experimenting on education, because in the matter of experimenting in the educational sphere, we have to do the experiment on the poor children. If it is experiment about the nutritional system, it is not on children, not on human beings but on other beings like rabbits, monkeys and so on. But in the matter of education, experiments are being conducted only on the children. I am anxious and I have no doubt hon. Members of the House are equally anxious that children should not be made victims of our experiments on education.

Sir, in considering questions relating to the educational system, one has to distinguish the acquisition of knowledge from the study of language. Language is a vital thing, particularly the mother tongue. We have to learn things, speak and express only through the language. Language is like the tongue. Without tongue you cannot speak. In the same way language is a vital need. But it is one thing to emphasise the study of language and its literature, and it is another thing to enable our students to acquire knowledge, as much knowledge as possible to meet the requirements of the day.

Sir, so far as promoting our mother-tongue Tamil and taking efforts to improve the growth of the already rich Tamil Literature is concerned, I may submit that this Government and I are second to none in our enthusiasm and in our earnestness. But, Sir, we should also realise that we, the citizens of this part of the country, are also citizens of India. There is unity in diversity. In this country many languages are spoken by people as their mother tongue. But still we have a sense of oneness and this sense of oneness has been there from time immemorial; from ancient times

3-20 p.m.

[Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam] [28th March 1963

there has been this sense of oneness. Our great seers, Alwars, Nayanmars and Jeers have been moving from one end of India to the other, from the Cape to the Himalayas. We have among our Alwars, 12 Alwars who visited in all 108 Vaishnava temples and sang hymns about those temples and their beauty and their sacredness. As I said, they wandered from the Cape to the Himalayas not in search of finding these 108 temples. They could have found these and even more even within a taluk or a district. They toured throughout India to stress the sense of unity of our country.

Now, there is great emphasis on the realisation of a sense of national integration on the part of our people particularly on the part of our youngsters. We have to see how we could promote still further this sense of national integration and we have also to take particular care that we do not do anything that would hinder this realisation of the sense of national integration.

Sir, in this country many languages are spoken and in our Constitution as many as 14 languages are listed as national languages. Not only the State Government but also the Central Government are interested in aiding the promition of all these various national languages. But, Sri, the Constitution framers had to solve the problem of evolving an official language for the country and they decided that Hindi shall be the official language because it is spoken by a large number of people inhabiting our country. But, Sir, we have been pointing out to the Centre and the Language Commission and other organizations that we in this part of the country would be faced with a handicap if Hindi alone were to be made the national language. Our people have been studying Hindi even voluntarily and there are very many good scholars in Hindi in this part of the country. Students and even parents are taking to the study of Hindi with great enthusiasm and fervour. But still we in this part of the country would be at a disadvantage if we are to handle affairs with the Centre through Hindi. We also realised that it would not be reasonable to insist on the adoption of every one of these fourteen languages. Therefore, we have suggested that English should be an associate language for the purposes of Central administration and affairs for an indefinite period. That has been agreed to and a Bill to effect this change is on the anvil.

We have also to remember that when students are taking higher education, they have large aspirations, not only the students but their parents, and not only the students and parents in the urban areas but people in rural areas even in the remotest village want higher education to be imparted to their children. They certainly aspire that their children should complete their studies here in this State and then go to other Universities and go even to Universities outside India and have further higher education. Not only are they interested in higher education for their children. Now there is a new thinking among them. Parents are interested in equipping their children, just as the

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

Government are interested in equipping the children, so that they may play their worthy part in moulding the destinies of our country.

Of course, Sir, this is a country where unemployment prevails and people use to talk more of the so-called educated unemployment. Of course, most of these people are middle-class people. They do not have a rich heritage to depend upon and those who have a heritage would certainly like their children to secure big offices and big positions after completion of the higher education. Now so many of our educated men are employed outside Madras State. They are in Delhi, they are in Bombay, they are in Calcutta. I want the House to remember this. The parents generally prefer their children to get into Government service and the Central Services are more attractive than the State Services. Therefore, the first aspiration of the parents and also the students is that they should appear for the Central Services examinations like the I.A.S. and the I.P.S. Now our State has agreed to the inclusion of the Forest Service, the Engineering Service and also the Medical Service in the All-India Services. Now if they want to get qualified for the Central Services, they have to appear and pass in the examinations prescribed by the Central Government. At a recent conference of the Education Ministers held in New Delhi this pointed question was raised whether the Central Government would agree to hold Central Examinations in the various State languages, that is, in fourteen different languages. The Education Minister at once cleared the doubt. He said that that was specifically considered by the Government and the Central Service examinations would be held only in English and also in Hindi and not in any other language. Of course, we can see, and I can see what it would be if a Central Service examination is to be held in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada, Bengali and so on. Those who are proficient in study through a particular language can serve only in that State and then they will cease to be in a Central Service. There is no particular merit in Central Service if facility should be given to students to study and answer in the various national languages of India.

Sir, these are things which I would like the House to bear in mind while considering the pattern of education that has been presented to this House.

There is now particular emphasis on technical education and on the intense study of science subjects even at the high school stage. The idea behind this pattern is that there must be technical bias that should be available, that should be present through all the stages of education. Then it is with a view to encouraging students to have intense study of science that electives have been suggested. That is the one change that has been made according to the pattern now suggested. The idea is to encourage and facilitate students in the secondary stage of education to have intense study of sciences.

[Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam] [28th March 1963

Sir, I am anxious that the uncertainty and indefiniteness that have been prevailing in the sphere of education should be removed without any further delay. Hon. Members will admit that there has been some uncertainty and there has been some indefiniteness, which are not in the interests of education. There has been the question whether the higher secondary course will be introduced in the secondary schools or this course of education should be put in the University. In our own days, there was the two-year degree course in the University. There was also the three- year Honours course. There was the two-year Intermediate course. For a normal graduate, the course was only for 4 years. If it was an Honours course, it was only for 5 years. Then we had this eleven years course when we were studying in secondary schools. But this Intermediate course was removed and in that place the Pre-University Course was introduced. It was thought then to be introduced as a temporary phase. So, it is to-day uncertain what is to be the future of the Pre-University Course and the colleges. The three year degree course has come to stay and I have not seen any one seriously suggesting that the 3 year degree course should be again meddled with and reduced to two years, and so on. Just a few minutes ago, a veteran educationist in the secondary education field was talking to me. He was not sure whether the Pre-University Course should remain in the College. But I asked him what was the alternative. I asked him to say whether higher secondary education should be introudced in our secondary schools as they are constituted to-day. We have got 1,800 secondary schools. What is the alternative? He admitted that there was no alternative. But still he was not happy. We have to take a decision. The Pre-University Course may be retained in the College. Of course, the University has been considering the changes in the syllabus for the Pre-University Course.

3-30 p.m.

Then, Sir, if the Pre-University Course is to remain in the College, we have also to take a decision that the higher secondary course will not go to the secondary schools. It is not a practicable thing. It is agreed to by all teachers, although some teachers would certainly like to have the higher secondary classes in their schools. But, I do see the difficulty in having the higher secondary course in the secondary schools. In this year, there may be 10 higher secondary schools and in the next year 20 more schools. This means again experimenting. I am sure, hon. Members will agree with me that there should be no more experimenting unless we launch on new experiments in the educational sphere. Therefore, we came to the decision that the higher secondary education course should not be in the secondary schools. When these are hanging in the balance, viz., whether the higher secondary course should go to the high school or not, last year a sudden decision was taken that instead of the 11 year course, it should be only 10 years. The condensing happened not in the higher classes but in the middle school classes. Classes 7 and 8 in the middle school classes were condensed into one class. Sir, I do not want to refer to an uncharitable comment made some time back that the plea on the part of certain people in favour of the 11-year Course was with a view to preserving

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

the interests of teachers who will be retrenched. This itself must be admitted as a serious problem in the reform of education. In any reform in education, we should not be obliged to send away teachers who have been there for long. But that is not the main point. That weighed with those who favoured a 11-year Course. Now people in the rural areas have, after all, come to realise that the minimum education that should be invariably imparted to their children, boys or girls, should be nothing less than secondary education. Two-thirds of the children that complete the secondary education course do not go in for higher education. They take to technical education and other courses. About one-third go in for higher education. Regarding this one-third who go in for higher education, we thought they should be specially equipped. It should not merely be by a mathematical calculation that we have to condense 7th and 8th standards into one. I had meetings with the Head-masters and teachers all over the State, almost in all the districts and they were of one view that this condensed course was not in the interest of the children, that the children were not able to grasp the lessons taught to them, etc. I have myself gone through the condensed text-books in Tamil. Even the Tamil text-books that were condensed were too much not only for the boys but also for the girls. One headmistress showed a condensed Tamil text-book and she said that the girls could hardly grasp the lessons in them. I said that it was too much for the girls. This is the foundation for secondary education from where they should go in for higher education. When they go in for higher education, the education that is given to them in the schools must be complete and the children must have a full grasp of the subjects taught to them. So, there was a unanimous view that in the interest of proper education of children, we must restore the 11-years course.

One education expert was talking to me a few minutes back. He asked me, "Why are you in hurry?" I said that this indefiniteness could not be indefinitely prolonged and that I was in a hurry because I did not want another academic year of indefiniteness. He pointed out that the secondary education committee was coming. Yes, it is coming on the 5th. The Central Secondary Education Committee is coming. We have got to refer to the Emotional Integration Committee. They have made recommendations. Our Government have examined them and have formulated some views about them. The Central Board of Education is also meeting. So many things are happening.. But should we be wainting for the recommendations of the Committees? After all, we have our own responsibilities. Should we be waiting for years till all these people sit together and discuss and evolve their own system? We know what our children want. Luckily, only last year this 11-year course was reduced to 10 years. Therefore, if we are clear in our minds that it should be 11 years and nothing less than 11 years, we can give effect to our decision without much of upset. This is the reason for our hurry. This is what I would like the Honourable House to consider. Therefore, I do hope that we will be able to settle all these questions that have not been settled so far and remove uncertainty and stop experimentation.

If we are going to experiment at all, we may have new experiments. But we should not go on experimenting as we have been doing all along. There is the University Course. There is the secondary education course and there is the primary course. So far as the primary and secondary education courses are concerned, it is now all an integrated course of 11 years. Formerly, there was this anomaly, which I was wondering how it could happen. One who gets through the elementary school was not automatically admitted in the middle school or high school. But it is now all one integrated course. The public examination for the VIII Standard has been removed. That has been done quite properly, I should say, because people will be satisfied with nothing less than complete secondary education. Therefore, we have taken away the public examination in the VIII Standard. But still, those who complete the VIII Standard can go to the junior technical schools or the industrial schools. We have now started polytechnics for girls also. Of course, for the regular polytechnics, getting a pass in the school final examination is the minimum qualification. But, in the junior technical schools, those who have got through the VIII Standard could join. But there will be no public examination in the VIII Standard.

3-40 p.m.

Then, I come to English teaching. About two or three years back the Southern States got together and evolved the three-language formula. Then, again, the representatives of the States of the Southern Zone at the Ministerial level as well as at the level of the Secretaries and officers met and took a decision that English should be taught from the Third Standard. Formerly it was so. Again there was change. English was taken away to a higher Standard. That was to a large extent responsible for the deterioration in the standard in English of our students. So, the decision was taken some time back by all the State that English should be taught from the Third Standard. But we introduced it from the Fifth Standard. Last year it was introduced in the Fourth Standard. From the coming year we propose to start teaching of English in the Third Standard. Hon. members are aware of the training in English teaching conducted successfully with the enthusiastic aid of the British Council.

About this three language formula, Part I is mother tongue or regional language. There is no change in it. The three-language formula for this State was subjected to a lot of discussion with the Official Language Commission. The Education Ministers' Conference appointed a committee to consider the implementation of the three-language formula in the various States. I am also a member of that committee and I shall be attending its meeting on the 15th and 16th April. So far as the three-language formula evolved by this State is concerned, hon. Members are quite well aware of it and I need not refer to it.

So far as Tamil teaching is concerned, hon. Members will have noticed that it is now an integrated course. It is not intensive teaching. It was so before. Now it is one integrated course and it is not proposed to touch that. It will remain as it is.

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

Then, regarding the third. part, we have put it as English or any other non-Indian language. Most pupils will take English. One idea behind putting any other non-Indian language, is that there should not be a sense of compulsion. Secondly, a particular student may have a fancy for French. Suppose he wants to go to Pondicherry and improve his own prospects. He may choose French and we should not mind it.

Then, I come to second part. It is Hindi or any other Indian language. Again, we have seen that any sense of compulsion creates quite an adverse reaction. So, we do not want to put in the idea of compulsion. Sometimes compulsion is inevitable in the general interests. But so far as language is concerned, one gets easily emotional and loses one's balance. Language is such a vital thing for it makes one lose one's balance. Therefore, we are quite anxious that there should not be any idea of compulsion in the pupil. We have said ' Hindi or any other Indian language other than the language mentioned in Part I '. If the student chooses, he can take any other language. I have seen that out of more than 50,000 students, except some 2,000 students who took Sanskrit and 200 and odd students who took Telugu, the bulk have taken Hindi voluntarily under this formula. I visited the other day a school in Madras City. The medium of instruction there in the secondary stage is Hindi. They are at all Hindi Students. If we put only Hindi, what is to happen to them? I asked them, ' What is the provision to enable them to study Tamil? ' They said that they took it under part II. If it is only Hindi, how could Hindi students take another language? Therefore, it is good that it is ' Hindi or any other Indian language '. We have not disturbed it.

Then, there is the question of examination. There was examination under the language formula which has been evolved and which is still in force. Students studying Hindi passed class examinations in the previous years. When they came to the X Standard or the final standard, they had to sit for the Public Examination but their marks were not to be taken into account. That was the system that had been in vogue. When I was going round and discussing with the Headmasters and other teachers, some of them said that if there was to be an examination which served no purpose that caused demoralisation in the students. Students sometimes treat the examination with contempt. So, I thought if there was to be an examination which would serve no purpose, rather we might not have that examination because I do not want students to develop any sense of contempt for examination. Examination is one method that has been evolved by educational experts in the world as the best method to make students study and acquire some knowledge. Therefore, I was anxious that students should not develope any contempt for examination in Hindi. But I have been repeating that it is only for this year and that I am prepared to discuss with the educational experts and consider any scheme or any system that could be evolved which would serve some purpose. So, after discussion with the members of the Consultative Committee, we have evolved the scheme. There

will be a public examination, but the marks obtained by students in Hindi or any other language under part II will not be taken into account for declaring eligibility for college admission. But if the boys sit for the examination and obtain some marks, these marks will be taken into account for the purpose of moderation. That will help students who have failed to secure minimum marks in other subjects on account of which they might have to fail. Then marks obtained in Hindi might be helpful. That is an inducement and that is a purpose.

Apart from that, I saw that the Government of India granted scholarships on the basis of marks obtained by the students in public examinations in Hindi. I saw that if there was to be no examination, the students would not avail themselves of this scholarship. Therefore, according to the pattern that has been presented to the House, there will be examination, but the marks will not be taken into account for the purpose of eligibility. But they will be taken into account if the students could study well and answer well. We do want boys to study Hindi. We are anxious that boys should not suffer from handicaps. But if they do not care, they may please themselves. That is the idea. There was no examination this year. What does it matter if the students have to sit for the examination besides attending the classes? If they do not care and if they are prepared to take the risk, there is no compulsion. So, practically there is no difference for those who do not want an examination. I attached importance to examinations. For those who do not want examinations it does not make any difference because the marks are not taken into account for the purpose of pass or eligibility.

3–50 p.m. Then, Sir, there is a comprehensive list of electives given for choice by the students. Perhaps they should do it in consultation with their headmasters. The subject of Social Studies has been split into history and geography. For the Social Studies there is the public examination. But under the scheme now presented. for history and geography there need be no examinations. I have been stressing the importance of the study of history and geography, Everybody realises the importance of the study of history and geography. Now some headmasters pointed out to me that it would be a retrograde step. They said : ' There was public examination in Social Studies. Now you have split it up into history and geography. There should be public examinations in them as there was in Social Studies '. If there is to be a regular public examination in these subjects and minimum marks are insisted on in these for a pass or eligibility, then it might be too much of a burden on the students, because including these selective subjects there will be examinations in about eight subjects. That will be too much of a burden on the students. Therefore. I am thinking of a formula although it is not put here as a recommendation. A formula has been adopted in the case of Hindi. For history and geography also there should be public examination but the marks obtained in them need not be taken into account for the purpose of eligibility. They may be taken into account for the purpose of moderation.

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

That is my view and I am presenting it to the House. The same formula we have suggested for Hindi, we can have for history and geography also. I do not want the students to feel. "When there is an examinaton for Hindi there is no examnation for history and geograhpy. Therefore, it means that they are not such important subjects. It is with that idea I am making this suggestion and I hope the hon. Members will accept the suggestion.

Then, Sir, about basic education, as has been pointed out in the note, there has been rethinking not only at the State level but also at the Central level. I accept the basic ideas behind the basic education. We have been examining it. There is a technical bias all through. We will see how we can incorporate the basic ideas behind the basic education in the scheme that is to be finally evolved.

Sir, we have given only a rough outline. The details have to be worked out and hon. Members will, therefore, see that this is quite flexible. Our idea is not to make it rigid. But I am also anxious that for some years to come, for at least ten years, there should not be any serious upsetting of the system of education. I do hope that the aspirations of the students and their parents will be fairly and satisfactorily met if we work out the scheme and implement it. I would only plead with all earnestness that while we consider problems of education in the interests of the future, in the interests of our children and in the interests of our country, we should not use them for any kind of political exploitation. I do not refer to any hon. Members of this House in this connection. I say we should not use these problems for any kind of exploitation, particularly political exploitation. We are all interested in the education of our children in the best manner possible.

I am greatly indebted to the hon. Members of this House, particularly the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Member Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar, the hon. Member Dr. A. Chidambaranathan and the hon. Member Sri T. P. Sinivasavaradan. They were all of great assistance to me in discussing the various questions and evolving this scheme. They have been continually assisting me and guiding me. I am only a layman so far as this education portfolio is concerned. I do believe in consulting those who have ideas and experience and benefiting by such experience and such guidance. I do hope, Sir, that this scheme will be approved by the House.

Then Sir, I have to refer to the most important matter, namely. the medium of instruction in the University. As I have said earlier, we have to distinguish between language and knowledge. We must try to understand the problem of medium of instruction this way. We teach mathematics, sciences, sociology, history, economics and so on to our boys. The question is how the boys would understand best what is taught to them. So far as secondary education is concerned, they are expected to acquire only elementary knowledge about these subjects, and I would prefer only Tamil as

[Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam] [28th March 1963

the medium of instruction even though you can teach them in English and the students can understand English. If you can satisfactorily teach in Tamil and make the students understand what they are taught, I would prefer only Tamil as the medium of instruction. But, Sir, in regard to higher education, in regard to medium of instruction in colleges, when we start the teaching of English from the III Standard, I have no doubt that the standard of English would improve. If the students complete this eleven year course and go to college, by then they would have picked up sufficient knowledge in English. But I do concede that they will understand the subjects if taught in Tamil at that stage. But the question is how to make them understand better, and what should be the medium to make them understand better. There are some subjects, I know, which could be taught adopting Tamil as the medium of instruction. It is not impossible or impracticable. I know we have also got teachers who can teach the most intricate subject in Tamil. But it is not merely a question of teaching even though we have got the teachers who can explain things in such a way in the mother tongue that the students understand the things clearly. Apart from teaching in Tamil, hon. Members are aware that in respect of higher education, the students should not be confined to a few text-books that are prescribed. They should be enabled to study more text-books and also read a number of other reference books. They are not available in the particular language in which they are to be taught. And then when they study a particular language in the College, they will be at a disadvantage if they want to apear for the Central Service Examination. They will be handicapped if they want to go to another university in the country or if they want to go to another country. That is the fear of the students. Of course we are strict about producing books in Tamil. I must, in this connection, express appreciation of the efforts of those who have been co-operating in this venture. But after and till the end of last year, we have published only 35 books. We have now produced about 17 or 18 books and 8 or 9 more will be available in the near future. On the whle, we will have about 60 or 62 books for all the subjects. This is thoroughly inadequate. It is easily urged on the Government that they should get these books written. It is not merely by ordering or indenting that you get these books. There is vast literature now available in English. Therefore, we found that the dictum that the colleges should switch over to Tamil as medium of instrution by 1962-63' was not a practical proposition, it is not one in the interest of national integeration, not in the interest of higher education and not in the interest of the students themselves. But we do want to encourage students to learn through Tamil. We give so many facilities to them. We will have additional sections besides English medium sections in the colleges. I have been repeating that if any management should come forward to provide instruction through the Tamil medium, I am prepared to give the management all help. I want more colleges which would encourage students to study M.A. Tamil. How many students are taking to M.A. in Tamil? I want all encouragement to be given and Government will give all the aid

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

to such efforts. I want more and more students to study Tamil literature. This is more important than merely learning Chemistry or Physics through the Tamil medium. Of course, I am not against it. I do envisage a time when it should be possible to have in our country as in other countries plenty of literature on various subjects in the mother tongue and students in the University should mostly learn the subjects through the Tamil medium. But there is no use making a fetish of these things. There is no use of introducing politics in these things. We have to look to the interests of the students. We have to see what the students and the parents in the rural areas aspire for. They even do not mind charging us that we have a superiority complex, a caste complex and that we are not interested in respect of the children of the poor rural areas getting higher education. They even charge us that we stand against 4-00 them. We should not lay ourselves open to such a charge. So, Sir, p.m. that is the background in which I hope the House will consider the scheme of education that has been presented and offer its support. Than you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :—

" That the Educational Pattern as enunciated in the note placed on the Table of the House on the 25th March be taken into consideration " Vidwan T. Muthukannappan has given notice of an amendment. He will please formally move it and have it seconded. The discussion will then proceed.

VIDWAN T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN : Sir, I move—

" *Add* the following at the end :

' and on such consideration, this House approves the Educational Pattern enunciated in the note."

SRI K. RAMADASS : I second the amendment, Sir.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Sir, I raise a point for your consideration. This is only a note prepared by the Government for the purpose of raising a discussion. There is no question of amendment. I am not speaking against the note at all. If there is a proposition that a certain thing is to be done, one can give notice of amendments. This is only a motion for taking into consideration the Educational Pattern. I am only on the technical point. I am not on the merits of the question. I want to make that very clear.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Chairman, the Education Minister has actually moved a motion before the House that the Educational Pattern as enunciated in the note be taken into consideration and that motion has to be disposed of in some form or other. The suggestion that has been put forward in the shape of an amendment is that it should be approved. This is the familar pattern in the Lok Sabha whenever a motion relating to external affairs, policy on education, or some new statement of policy is made by the Government. Then it is approved by the House in the form of an amendment. There are precedents for this.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The amendment is in order.

[28th March 1963

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be failing in my duty, if I do not pay my tributes to the Government for having laid at rest so much of controversy that was prevalent about the 11 year course and the introduction of the higher secondary class in the high schools. I am glad that the Government have come forward now to state plainly that there will be no XI Standard equivalent to the Pre-University Class in the high school and that they will be content with old pattern of S.S.L.C. I am not at all against the introduction or addition of a year to cover the old X Standard, because we were having 11 years of education for a number of years in the hight school. Now Sir, this scheme of education just before the house has solved many difficulties. The parents were thinking that by this scheme of intraducing XI Standard in the high school and converting the high school into a higher secondary school, they would have to wait one more year for putting their children in any job. Teacters were anxious that many of them would have to get themselves qualified more in order to retain their places in the high school. The head-masters were anxious that they would have to get the Post-Graduate degree to retain their posts. The colleges were afraid that most of their buildings would become vacant and the laboratory useless by the taking away of the P.U.C. course from them. High schools were afraid that they could not provide themselves, however much with Government help, with the necessary buildings and equipment to tackle this XI Standard. Now this scheme has solved all these difficulties. We are to have a 11 year course—a breath course, a course that gives one year more to the pupil to just take his studies. Now, in spite of all these advantages, there are some defects which we have to look into. The Hon. the Minister for Education was just now stating that this scheme at least should be there without any change for another 10 years. Though the Hon. Minister admits that education is a changing process and that the education of the days of Valluvar and Kambar cannot exist now, education is a process that adjusts itself with the advance of knowledge of the times. He admitted that we should not experiment far too often, the experiment being on human beings and not on beasts. To that extent we welcome the idea of the Government and we want the Government to rectify the few defects that have crept into this scheme that has been placed on the table of the House. Now, itself if the defects are avoided, as the Hon. Minister envisages, there would be no need for touching the scheme for another decade at least. The most glaring defect is the omission of a prominent place for Humanities. Education, if we may say so, has got two eyes. One is the Science and the other Humanities. Now, this scheme, as placed before us, is, if I may so call it, an one-eyed scheme. It cannot produce good vision-proper vision to the pupils who undergo this scheme. The value of Humanities cannot be undermined. There is no country which does not stress on Humanities. It is a sad plight in our country that of late from Kashmir to Cape Comorin, the parents have a tendency to make their boys give more attention to science subjects, because the attention to science, taking of

28th March 1963] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

sciene, qualification in science like mathematics and sciences give better prospects to their children. But when that is the case, we expect the Government just to see how things are moving with reference to parents who are ultimately responsible for the encouragement of these subjects in respect of their children who are to be future citizens of the country. To just place things in a better position, Humanities must be encouraged. Special encouragement is required for Humanities when we are facing an emergency in which we want all our children to have that national spirit that patriotic spirit and that deep national consciousness which will allow them and make them stake anything for the defence of the country. It is but proper that Humanities is given a better place than it had been given in the previous scheme. The contrary is the case with the present scheme. When once a subject is a non-examination subject, we know how much attention is possible in a school with regard to it from the stuents. Naturally, if interest is lacking in students; the teachers will have to go that way. Days are such. So, humanities deserve better consideration than the considertion that we have given to it all these years. Reducing a subject into a non-examination subject or even an announcement as the Hon. Minster just now proposed that History and Geography would not be examination subjects, the marks obtained therein would not be taken into account for purpose of eligibility to enter the college, but they would count for moderation, which is as good as not having an examination at all, is not a proper thing. We must see that history and geography or **4–10 p.m.** at least outlines of history and geography, which I described before, form a main part of the educational pattern. It should be a core subject. We have introduced two core subjects, according to the scheme—General Mathematics and General Science. History and geography should get their place as the third core subject. If outlines of history and geography at least are included as a third ore subject, then the question of electives comes Every student has to read and learn three languages and then three core subjects (according to me) and then two electives according to the proposal under the scheme, besides History and Geography. I repeat that even according to the present scheme placed on the table of the House, the student has to learn nine subjects. He has to learn two core subjects, three languages and two electives, besides history and geography. Now, according to the proposed Governments scheme at least 42 periods are required for these nine subjects because History and Geography are there. But, according to the plan suggested, by me is history and Georaphy are taken as Outlines of History and Geography and declared as one of the core subjects. naturally one of the electives can be taken away. Now, it is an open fact and admitted fact that most of the students are school-leavers, they do not enter the portals of the college. The Hon. Minister said that two-thirds did not enter the colleges. But my own calculation is that 80 per cent do not enter the colleges. When that is the case and when it has been all along our admitted aim that the secondary education course should be a course

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [28th March 1963

complete by itself to equip citizens with a broad knowledge of Elementary Mathematics, General Science and Humanities—History and Geography, is it not but proper that we include History and Gography as a core subject and take away one of the electives? The elective element has always been there. Even now in Composite Mathematics, there is the elective element. In the bifurcated course there is the electve element. Bifurcated courses are going to be there and so it is enough we have one elective. There were days when we had one elective, namely, Optional, and there would not be duplication of efforts also. A stulent takng here General Mathematics and General Science which he has to take as core subjects takes again Mathematics and Physics as electives. Mathematics and Physics is bound to have overlapping and duplication. Though it may be an intensive study, yet will it not be better if such a student were to learn Humanities and also one of the electives? Every student in India must be acquainted with the history and geography of his locality. Of course, they are Humanities. They have been serving the cause of humanity. Knowledge of humanities is essential to rule the country. The scientist comes only next. There is another difficulty here. If we have two electves, a large gap will come between the rural parts and the urban parts. If there are two electives, schools will have more attendance for the science class. Even for general science there is not enough equipment in high school at present. It we want to have physics, chemistry and so on and if the rural schools are to be equipped, how many years will it take? Would it not be better even to confine ourselves to one elective and take history and geography as a core subject? In addition to all these things, that consideration, that history and geography should not be relegated to the background, which Government have done should weigh with the Government. These are days when we want pupils to know more about their country, more about their environment, more about other countries and be of service to the nation. National integration can be achieved only through a proper prespective with which we are to equip these children. These are citizens of to-morrow. Shall we produce in Tamil Nad alone or in India alone students who do not know their own country's history and geography? Prominence is given in other countries to these two subjects. They are commanding subjects and it is the statesmen who command war even. It is in their hands to declare a war or stop a war, to declare an emergency or to end an emergency. The scientist is there only to obey the statesmen there. So, however much the parents may have faith in science, physics and so on in order to make their sons earn more, Government should show them the right way, that a statesman is to lead them, and that a spirit of natioanl consciousness can alone serve the country not only now in emergency but also in times of peace. As such, my humble plea is that the core subjects should be three and that the third subject should be outlines of history andgeography. Now, there should be only one elective. Let the three languages stand. So, the student will have to study three core subjects, three languages and one elective.

28th March 1963] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

Now, because history and geography are there as a core subject, that problem of periods is solved. The number of periods—35—which we have now would be quite enough. The attention of pupils would be there on the humanities and the cause of the nation would be served. If there are two electives, most of the students under the guidance of their parents would rush only to science. The rural parts would suffer without proper laboratory and without proper teaching of science. It has been our experience even now with regard to general science, and this procedure which I suggest and which is voiced forth by a number of educatonists whose mouthpiece I am to-day has really to be welomed by the Government in the interests of the children and also the nation.

With regard to Sanskrit, I am very thankful to the Government for having given a little prominence to Sanskrit by making it an elective. Now the position is this. It is there already as a language under Part II. At the Chief Ministers' Conference it was decided and it has been declared in this printed note that in respect of languages, instruction can commence at an earlier stage. According to the present scheme placed here, the teaching is to commence only in the IX Standard, and that too is left to the discretion of the management. The maximum number of years of learning that students can have under Sanskrit is three years, and with this learning of three years, can he proceed to the college and take Sanskrit there?. Though we do not want the college curriculum to dominate our school curriculum the fact is there that 20 per cent of the students go there. There they have got Humanities as a compulsory subject. But in the high school we do not want to give humanities its prominent place, and we want to relegate it to the background. In the college the students must be able to take Sanskrit. In the schools they will learn it for three years and that at a late stage, from the IX Standard. That will not be enough. Out culture is embedded in Sanskrit. All the States in India are encouraging Sanskrit. Our history, geography, mathematics, philosophy, astrology, ayurveda, medical science, everything is in Sanskrit. We are not able to draw it out for want of sufficient knowledge. Those students who learn a little of Sanskrit may not be able to draw out all these things. Let us at least see that there are some people in the future generatons who continue to have faith in them so that like Ramanujam in Mathematics, they may probe into the records of the Saraswathi Mahal Library and other records that may be left in the future, and find out how great we were, how much of learning there is and how much we are yet to learn. So, Sanskrit teaching must be commenced in a lower class. It must be commenced at least in the VI Standard, though not in the III Standard as we do in the case of English. In the case of English we do want to learn it only with utility as our aim, to study many books, as the Hon. Minister said, to learn how the world is progressing and so on. But all this progress is embdded, more progress is embdded in Sanskrit literature. It has been catering to the west. The west has been able to find out from our records what inventions can be made. We have lost faith in our ancestors who had much of learning, in spite

of the fact that fifteen years have gone by since the attainment of Swaraj. It is out culture which exists throughout the world. It is Sanskrit which has told the west the manufacture of bombs and aeroplanes. There were days when we were laughing when a teacher taught that Rama was taken to Bharata in an aeroplane within 24 hours. Then we atleast thought that Ramayana could be included in history. Aeroplane, the description of which you find in Valmiki Ramayana in original Sanskrit, could be produced. It is faith in these things that has made the west invent many things. It is want of faith that has brought us to this low position. Let us see that Sanskrit is restored to its original place, though not as a spoken language, at least as a treasure which must be preserved and which the student should learn at an early stage.

Finally, Sir, I will conclude with the plea that though details are to be worked out later, moral instruction should be provided at all the stages of this curriculum. Sir, I have always been making a plea in this House about the content of education. This scheme deals only with the number of hours, the number of periods and the number of subjects and so on. But I have always pleaded that it is the content of education that is more important than these. The history books which were written by the Britishers and which discredit us and which still describe us as slaves are there in spite of the fact that we have been an independent country for more than fifteen years. Even though fifteen years have passed since we attained Swaraj anti-national and anti-social ideas are still there in the arithmetic books and in the history books. Futile ideas are still there in the science books and geography books. All these should be looked into and when framing the detailed syllabus, those who are put in charge of such work by the Government should be given clear instructions that everything that they do should aim at only one thing, namely, to make the pupils think that they are Indians first and Indians last.

Thank you, Sir.

*__திரு. க. அன்பழகன்__: சட்டமன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, அரசாங்கத்தின் சார்பில் வெளியிடப்பட்டிருக்கிற கல்விமுறைத் திருத்தத்திற்கான குறிப்பின்மீது என்னுடைய கருத்துக்கள் சில வற்றை எடுத்துவைப்பதற்கான வாய்ப்பு அளித்தமைக்கு நான் நன்றி தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். 1957-ம் ஆண்டு நவம்பர் திங்களில் அதுவரையில் நாட்டில் நடைபெற்றுவந்த கல்விமுறை மாணவர்களை முன்னேற்றுவதற்குப் போதுமானதாக இல்லை என்ற எண்ணத்தை மேற்கொண்டு, அந்த முறையை மாற்றியமைக்கும் ஒரு புதிய திட்டத்தை மாநிலக் கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் சட்ட மன்றத்தில் வைத்தார்கள். அவர்கள் அதைக் கொண்டுவந்த காலத்தில் அதற்கான முழு பரிசீலனையும் தனிப்பட்டவகையில் நடைபெறுமலே, அந்தத் திருத்தத்தை நாட்டிலுள்ள எல்லா மாணவர்களும் எல்லாக் கல்வி நிலையங்களும் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்ற நிலையை உண்டாக்கிய காரணத்தால், இன்றைய

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

தினம் கல்வித் திட்டத்தை ஓரளவுக்கு மாற்றவேண்டிய, புதுப்பிக்கவேண்டிய அவசியத்தில் அரசாங்கமும் அதைப்போலவே கல்வித்துறையில் ஈடுபட்டவர்களும் இருக்கிருர்கள்.

உண்மையாகவே, இது ஒரு புதிய கல்வித் திட்டம் என்று கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் குறிப்பிட விரும்பவில்லை. ஏனெனில், அவர்களுடைய எண்ணமாக இருக்கக்கூடியது, இதை ஒரு புதிய கல்வித் திட்டம் என்று கூறிடின் ஐந்தாண்டு காலத்தில் மாற்ற நேரிட்டால் என்னசெய்வது என்பதே! எனவேதான் கல்வித் திட்டத்தில் ஏற்படக்கூடிய மாற்றத்தைக்கூட சாதாரணமான மாற்றமென்று விளக்கியிருக்கிருர்கள். புதிய திட்டத்தை ஆராய்கிற நேரத்தில் சென்றமுறை அந்தத் திட்டம் வந்தபோது நான் தெரிவித்த கருத்தை இப்போது நினைவூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். "இத்திட்டமானது நிரந்தரமான நன்மை பயக்கும் என்ற முழு நம்பிக்கையைப் பெற முடியவில்லை. அந்த நிலையில் இதையே நிலைபெறும் சட்டமாகவும் செய்யவேண்டுமென்றால் திருத்தமுடியாத நிலைமையில் பல்வேறு சிக்கல்கள் ஏற்பட்டு பெரும் தவறுகள் விளையுமாதலின், நல்லமுறையில் பரிசோதித்துப்பார்த்து மூன்று நான்கு ஆண்டுகள் பயிற்சிக்குப் பிறகு குற்றம் குறைகள் இல்லையென்று கருதினால், நிரந்தரமாக நிறைவேற்ற முன்வரலாம்" என்று எனது கருத்தை புதிய திட்டம் வந்த நேரத்தில் சட்டசபையில் எடுத்துக் கூறியிருக்கிறேன். இப்போது வரும் திட்டம்கூடப் பரிசீலனைக்குரியது. முழு அளவுக்குப் பயன்நோக்கிப் பரிசீலிக்க வேண்டுமென்றுதான் அமைச்சர் அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். திருத்தத்தில் எந்த அளவு ஏற்றுக்கொள்வது என்பதில் பின்னால் இடையூறுக்கு இடமில்லாமல் இருக்கும் திருத்தங்களையே ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். பழமையில் காணும் திருத்தமாக இருந்தாலும் புதுமையில் காணும் மாற்றமானாலும் எந்த அளவுக்கு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளத் தக்கதாக இருக்குமோ அந்த அளவுக்குத்தான் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். பெரிய மாற்றங்களைத் தமிழ் நாட்டிலுள்ள எல்லாக் கல்வி நிலையங்களிலும் நிறைவேற்ற முன்வருகிற நேரத்தில் செயல் முறையில் நடக்குமா என்றும் ஆராயவேண்டும். அரசாங்கத்தின் சார்பில் இதற்கு முன்னால் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட திட்டம் நடை முறையில் நிறைவேற்ற முடியாத நிலையில் இருப்பதால்தான் இப்போது அந்தத் திட்டத்தைக் கைவிட வேண்டிய நிர்பந்தத்தில் இருப்பதை கல்வியமைச்சர் அவர்களே ஒப்புக்கொள்வார்கள். எனவே திட்டங்களை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கான வாய்ப்புகள், கருவிகள், நிதிவசதி இவைகளைத் தேடிக்கொள்வதற்கான முறையில் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் முன்கூட்டியே திட்டமிட வேண்டுமென்றுவேண்டிக் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

அரசாங்கத்தின் கொள்கை என்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்ட கொள்கையைப் பின்னர் கைவிட்டுக்கொண்டே போவது நல்லதல்ல. செயல்முறையில் முடியாததால் விட்டுவிட்டோம் என்று ஆட்சிப் பொறுப்பில் உள்ள அமைச்சர் எந்தக் காரணத்தை முன்னிட்டும் தெரிவிக்கும் நிலைமை ஏற்படக்கூடாது. கல்வி அமைச்சர் பி. ஏ. வகுப்பில், கலையியல் பாடங்களைத் தமிழில் பயில்வதில் மாணவர்கட்குப் போதுமான ஆர்வம் ஏற்படாத காரணத்

தால் அதையே குறையாகக் கொண்டு, போதுமான மாணவர்கள் தமிழில் பயில வாராத காரணத்தால் அதைப் பயனில்லாத காரிய மென்று தெரிவித்துவிட்டார்கள். அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் புதிய இலாகா பொறுப்பேற்றுக் கொண்டிருக்கிற நேரத்தில் என்றைக் காவது ஒருநாள் தமிழ் எல்லாத்துறைகளிலும் ஆட்சிமொழியாக வும், எல்லா நிலைகளிலும் பயிற்சி மொழியாகவும் வரவேண்டு மென்ற இலக்கினையும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளும் நேரத்தில் அந்த ஆர்வம் குறையும்படி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் பேசியது தமிழ் எல்லா நிலை களிலும் வரவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தில் இருந்தவர்களுக்கு மிகப் பெரிய வருத்தத்தை அளித்திருக்கிறது.

பி. ஏ. வகுப்பில் மூன்று நான்கு கல்லூரிகளில் தமிழ் பயிற்சி மொழியாக வைத்திருந்துங்கூட அதில் சலுகைகள் பல அளித்தும் மாணவர்கள் முன்வரவில்லையென்று புள்ளிவிவரத்தோடு தெரிவித் தார்கள். பொதுவில் கலையியல் பாடம் படிக்க வருகிற மாணவர் களே குறைவு ; விஞ்ஞானம் படிக்கிற மாணவர்கள் சிறுபான்மை யினர்தான் வருவர் என்பதைக் கல்வித்துறையில் தொடர்புள்ள வர்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொள்வார்கள். தமிழில் கலையியல் படிக்க வருவோர் எண்ணிக்கை குறைவாக இருப்பதில் ஆச்சரியப்பட வேண்டியதில்லை. மாற்றங்கள் விளைகையில் டிரான்ஸ்மிஷன் காலத்தில், திருப்பம் ஏற்படும்போது இந்த முறையில் பயின்றால் வெளியில் நமக்கு வேலைக்கான வாய்ப்பு இருக்குமென்ற உறுதி பிறக்கும் வரையில் மாணவர்கள் குறைவாகத்தான் வருவார்கள். வேலைக்கு விண்ணப்பிக்கும்போது தமிழில் படித்தவர்களை ஒதுக்கி விடுவார்களோ என்ற கவலையோடு ஆங்கிலம் படிக்கிறார்கள். அலுவலுக்கு ஆங்கிலத்தில் படித்திருக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்பார் களோ என்ற பயமும், ஆங்கிலம் படித்தவர்களுக்கான வாய்ப்பு நமக்கு இருக்காது என்ற ஐயமும் இருக்கிற காரணத்தால்தான் தமிழில் பயில்வதற்கு தாமாகவே வராமல் இருக்கக்கூடும். இவற்றையும் எதிர்பார்த்துத்தான் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் திட்ட மிட்டிருக்கவேண்டும். அது ஒரு குற்றமாகாது. எதிர்காலத்தில் எப்படியும் தமிழ் வளர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமென்ற காரணத்தால் இதில் ஆர்வம் காட்டவேண்டுமென்று அமைச்சர் அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். இந்த அரசாங்கம் என்றைக்கிருந்தாலும் தமிழிலே கல்லூரிக் கல்வி அளிக்கத்தான் முற்படும் என்ற கொள்கையை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளும் நேரத்தில் அதைத் தளர்த்து கின்ற வகையில் அரசாங்கம் குறிப்பிடுமானால் கல்வித்துறையில் இருக்கிற பலர் தமிழ்மொழி மூலம் கல்வி அளிக்கும் நோக்கத்தை விட்டு ஆங்கில மொழிதான் கல்விக்குச் சிறந்தது என்ற மாறு பாடான கருத்தில் செல்லக்கூடும். பல ஆண்டுகட்குமுன் அண்ணா மலைப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தில் தமிழில் கல்லூரி வகுப்புகளில் பாடங்கள் பயிற்றுவிக்கலாமென்ற கருத்து மேற்கொள்ளப்பட்டபிறகு அதைத் தடுத்துவிடவும் கைவிடச்செய்யவும் முயற்சிகள் தோன்றின. இப்போது அதுபோன்ற ஒரு கருத்துப் போராட்டத்தை ஏற்படுத்த அரசாங்கம் இடம் தந்து விட்டது குறித்து வருந்துகிறேன். பி. ஏ. வகுப்பு மாண வர்கள் தமிழில் படிக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், கலையியல் பாடங் களைத் தமிழில் படிக்கிற முறையில் தமிழ்நாடு முழுவதும் ஒரு

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

முறையாக இருக்கவேண்டும். பல்கலைக் கழகத்தில் முதல்நிலை வகுப்பில் பி.யு.சி. புகுமுக வகுப்புக்களில் கலையியல் பாடங்களை எல்லோரும் ஆங்கிலத்தில்தான் படிக்கிறார்கள். பி.ஏ. வகுப்புக் களில் தமிழில் படிக்க ஆர்வம் உண்டாக்கவேண்டுமென்று நினைக்கிற அரசாங்கம் அதில் உண்மையாக இருப்பின் முதல்நிலைப் படிப்பை தமிழில் நடத்த ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கவேண்டும். உயர்தர நடுநிலைக் கல்வி வகுப்பான ஹையர் செகண்டரி கோர்ஸ் ஏற்படுத்துவதாக இருந்த நேரத்தில் உயர்நிலைப் பள்ளிக்கூடங்கள் இருந்தும், அதற்கான வசதிகள் இல்லாததால், போதுமான நிதி யில்லாததால், ஆராய்ச்சிக்கூடங்கள் அமைப்பதற்கு வசதியில்லை என்ற காரணத்தால் உயர்தரப் பயிற்சி பெற்ற ஆசிரியர்கள் இல்லாத காரணத்தால், அதனையே பல்கலைக்கழக புகுமுக வகுப் பாக ஏற்படுத்த நேரிட்டது.

ஹையர் செகண்டரி படிப்பு என்னும் திட்டம் நிறைவேற்றப் படவில்லை என்று சொன்னால் அதற்கான வசதி இல்லை, போதுமான அளவு நிதி இல்லை, ஆராய்ச்சிக்கூடங்கள் அமைப்பதற்கு வசதி யில்லை, பயிற்சி பெற்ற ஆசிரியர்கள் இல்லை என்று இப்படி எத்தனை யோ காரணங்கள் இருந்தன. எனவே இந்த நிலையில் அது பல்கலைக்கழகத்தின் புகுமுக வகுப்பாக இருக்கட்டும் என்று ஏற்க வேண்டிய நிலை ஏற்பட்டது. உயர்நிலைப்பள்ளியின் இறுதி கட்ட வகுப்பாக அது ஏற்பட்டு இருக்குமானால் உயர்நிலை பள்ளியில் நேற்றைய 10-வது வகுப்பு வரையிலோ, நாளைய 11-வது வகுப்பு வரையிலோ, அல்லது S.S.L.C. வரையிலோ தமிழில் படிக்கிற மாணவர்கள் பி.யு.சி. புகுமுகவகுப்புக்கு ஈடான அந்த வகுப்பை தமிழ்மொழி மூலமே படிக்க நேரிட்டு இருக்கும். மாறாகத் தமிழிலே படிக்கின்ற வாய்ப்பு தடுமாறிப்போய் அதை இழந்து பல்கலைக்கழக வகுப்பாக இணைக்கப்பட்ட காரணத்தால் ஆங்கிலத்திலே படிக்க வேண்டிய முறை இருக்கிறது. அந்த வகுப்பில் ஆங்கிலத்தில் பயின்று தேர்வு எழுதியபின் மறுபடியும் தமிழிலே பி.ஏ. வகுப்பில் படிக்க வேண்டும் என்று திட்டமிடுவது ஏறத்தாழ, வண்டிக்கு முன்னால் மாட்டை பூட்டுவதற்கு பதில் மாட்டுக்கு முன்னால் வண்டியைப் பூட்டும் செயலாக இருக்கிறது என்று நிச்சயமாக வருத்தத்தோடு நினைவூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். பி.யு.சி. வகுப்பு பல்கலைக்கழக முறைப்படி கல்லூரியில் இருக்க லாம் என்று கல்வித்திட்ட ஆலோசனை குழு ஏற்றுக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறது. பி.யு.சி. வகுப்புப் பாடங்களை ஆங்கிலத்தில்தான் நடத்தவேண்டுமென்ற கருத்து இருக்குமானால், பல்வேறு வகை யான கல்வியையும் தமிழிலே கொண்டு வருவோம் என்ற கருத்து கைவிடப்பட்டதே ஆகும். அப்படி பி.யு.சி. வகுப்பில் பயிலும் மாணவர்களில் மேற்கொண்டு பொறியியல் துறையிலோ, அன்றி மருத்துவத் துறையிலோ, கணிதத்துறையிலோ ஈடுபட விரும்பு கின்றவர்கள், அவற்றிற்கான பாடங்களை மட்டும் ஆங்கிலத்தில் படித்துக்கொள்வதில்கூட குற்றமில்லை.

4–30 p.m.

அடுத்து மாநில ஆட்சிமொழி தமிழ் ஆன பின்னர் உண்மை யாகவே கல்லூரிக் கல்வி தமிழிலேதான் இருக்கவேண்டும். புதிய தமிழகத்துடைய தேவை அது ஆகும். புதிய தமிழகத்தின் தேவை நாட்டு மக்களிடம் அறிவு பாவ வேண்டும் என்பது. இன்று

[திரு. க. அன்பழகன்] [28th March 1963

ஆங்கிலம் மூலம் கற்றவர்களால் மக்களிடையே அறிவு பரவுவதை விட, தமிழ் கற்றவர்களாலேயே நாட்டு மக்களிடையே அறிவு பரவுகின்றது. ஓரளவு கற்ற மக்களிடம் ஆங்கிலம்மூலம் கருத்துக்கள் பரவுவதும் இல்லை. விஞ்ஞான கருத்து, வேறு துறைகளில் தொடர்புடைய கருத்துக்கள் மக்களிடம் பரவ வேண்டும் என்கிற நிலையில் தாய்மொழி மூலமாகக் கல்வி அளிக்கப்படும் நிலைமை ஏற்பட வேண்டும்.

தனியார் முயற்சியில் அமைக்கப்படுகிற கல்லூரிகள் தமிழில் நடத்தப்படுவதை ஏற்போம் என்று சொல்வது இந்த பொறுப்பை அரசு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாமல் விட்டுவிடும், மற்றவர்கள் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளட்டும் என்று கைவிடுகிற முறையே ஆகும். அரசாங்கத்தைவிட பொறுப்பு மிக்கவர்கள் வெளியிலிருந்து முன் வருவார்கள் என்று எதிர்பார்ப்பது தவறுகும். அப்படிக் கல்லூரி தொடங்கினுல் வாழ்த்துச் சொல்கிற அரசாங்கத்தின் பொறுப்பு என்ன? இனி கல்லூரிகளில் கலையியல் பாடங்கள் யாவும் தமிழில் நடத்தப்படும் என்ற முறையை இந்த ஆண்டே நிறைவேருவிடினும்—விரைவில் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு ஏற்ப பி.எ. வகுப்பில் கலையியலில் புதிய பிரிவு ஏற்படுத்தினுலும் அதைத் தமிழ் மூலம் நடத்தச் செய்வதற்கும், எந்த அரசாங்கக் கல்லூரியிலே இப்பொழுது பி.எ. கலையியல் வகுப்புக்கள் நடத்தப்படுவதாயினும் அந்தக் கல்லூரியில் ஏதாவது ஒரு கலையியல் பாடம் தமிழில் நடத்துமாறு செய்ய உடனடியாக அரசினர் வழி செய்ய வேண்டும். உடனடியாக ஒரு கல்லூரி சரித்திரம் அல்லது வரலாற்றைத் தமிழில் நடத்தட்டும். இன்னொரு கல்லூரியில் பொருளியலோ, புவியியலோ, தத்துவமோ கல்லூரியில் தமிழிலே நடத்தட்டும். ஒவ்வொரு கல்லூரியிலும் ஒன்றிரண்டு பாடாமாவது தமிழிலே நடத்தப்படும் முறையை இந்த ஆண்டே மேற்கொள்ளவேண்டும். இதை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்குத் தகுதியுடைய ஆசிரியர்கள் பலருள்ளனர். அவர்கள் ஆங்காங்கு நியமிக்கப்படவேண்டும். பொருளியலைத் தமிழில் படித்துவிட்டு ஒருவேளை வரலாற்றை ஆங்கிலத்தில் படிக்க நேரிட்டாலும், வேறுவகையாக அமையினும் அது இந்த நிலையில் வரவேற்கத்தக்கதே என்று தான் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்வேன். பல்கலைக்கழக பட்டப்படிப்பு தேர்வு எழுதுகிற நிலையிலும் அவர் அவர்கள் பயின்ற முறைக்கேற்ப எந்தப் பாடத்தையும் தமிழிலே படித்து எழுதுவதற்கும், ஆங்கிலத்திலே எழுதுவதற்கும் வாய்ப்பு அளிக்கப்படுமானல் அந்த நிலையில், எல்லாப் பாடங்களையும் தமிழில் பயில்வதற்கான ஆர்வமும், நம்பிக்கையும் வளரவும், தமிழில் கொண்டுவருவதற்கான செயல்கள் சிறக்கவும் அதுவே துணையாகும். கல்லூரியில் பயிலும் விஞ்ஞானப் பகுதிப் பாடங்கள்கூடத் தமிழிலே வருவது எளிதாகும். அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் அடிக்கடி சொல்வதுபோல விஞ்ஞானப் பாடங்களில் கடன் வாங்குகிற சொற்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்குமே தவிர அந்தச் சொற்கள் புகுந்தாலுங்கூடப் பாடங்களைத் தமிழில் நடத்த முடியும். அந்த வகையில் பல்கலைக் கழகக் கல்வி நாட்டுமக்களுக்குப் பயன்படக்கூடிய சிறந்த முறையில் அரசாங்கம் பணியாற்ற வேண்டும் என்று தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

அடுத்து, தெரிவிக்க விரும்புவது அரசாங்கத்தின் மும்மொழிக் கொள்கைபற்றியதாகும். இதில் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இருக்கிற குழப்பம் எளிதாகத் தீர்வது இல்லை. மாநில அரசாங்கத்துக்கு சில சமயங்களில் தெளிவு வந்தாலும் மத்திய அரசாங்கம் குழப்பி விட்டு விடுகிறது. ஏறத்தாழ 20 ஆண்டுக் காலமாக, இந்தி புகுத்தப் படுவதை எதிர்க்கும் தமிழனுடைய வரலாறு இருக்கிறது. அந்த உணர்ச்சியை எண்ணிப் பார்த்ததாலும் சட்டமன்ற எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் எடுத்துச் சொன்னதாலும் ஓரளவுக்கு இணங்கி இந்தியை விருப்பப் பாடம் என்ற பேரால்—பேர் அளவுக்கே—ஏற்றுக் கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். நான் பெயர் அளவுக்கு என்று சொல்கிற போது திரும்பத் திரும்ப அதை நினைவூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இந்தி மொழி விருப்பப் பாடமே என்று சொல்கிறார்கள். மத்திய அரசாங்கம் கேட்கிறபோதுகூட விருப்பப் பாடமாக வைத்திருக்கிறோம். அதுவே இந்தியைப் பரப்ப ஏற்றது என்று சொல்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் இப்போது நடைமுறையில் அது ஒரு கட்டாய பாடமாக இருக்கிறது. இன்றைக்கு ஒரு தமிழ் நாட்டு மாணவன் இயல்பாகத் தமிழைப் படிக்கிறவன் இரண்டாவது மொழியாக இந்தி படிக்க வேண்டி இருப்பது தவிர வேறு எது இருக்கிறது என்று கேட்கிறேன்? அந்த மாணவர்கள் இந்திப் படிப்பிலே ஆர்வம் உள்ளவர்களா? விரும்பியவர்களா? விருப்பம் இல்லாதவர்கள் படிக்காமல் இருக்க இடமுண்டா? அதனால் தேர்வு எழுதாமல் இருக்கிறார்களா? என்னுடைய கருத்து விருப்பப் பாடம் என்று சொல்லிவிட்டு மறைமுகமாகத் திணிக்கப்படுகின்ற நிலைமை இந்தியைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் இருக்கிறது என்பதாகும். அதைத்தவிர வேறு மொழிப் பாடம் இல்லை என்று பள்ளிகளில் சொல்கிறார்கள். பள்ளியில் சேரும் மாணவர்கள் முதல் மொழி தமிழ், தாய் மொழி, அதைத்தான் எடுத்துக்கொள்கிறேன்; மூன்றாவது மொழியான ஆங்கிலம் படிக்க வேண்டிய மொழியாக இருக்கிறது, இசைகிறேன்; இரண்டாவது மொழியாக உள்ள இந்தியில் எனக்கு விருப்பமில்லை, வேறு மொழிக்கு இடம் இருக்கிறதா என்று கேட்டால் என்ன பதில் கிடைக்கும்? பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் தெலுங்குக்கு வாய்ப்பு இல்லை. மலையாளம் படிக்க வேண்டுமானால் அதற்கும் ஆசிரியர் இல்லை. வேறு மொழி கற்க வாய்ப்பு இல்லை. இதை நான் குறிப்பிடுகிற போது, மற்றொன்றையும் நினைவூட்டுகிறேன். ஏற்கனவே ஒரு திட்டம் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டு இருந்தது, நம்முடைய மாநிலத்திலே 52, 53-ம் ஆண்டிலே நடைமுறையிலிருந்த அந்தத் திட்டத்தின்படி, இந்தி மொழி படிக்க விரும்பாதவர்கள், தங்களுடைய தாய் மொழியிலே, தமிழ் மொழியிலே சிறப்பு அறிவு பெற வாய்ப்பு அளித்திருந்தனர். உண்மையாகவே இந்தி விருப்பப் பாடம் ஆகவேண்டுமானால் வேறு மொழிப் பாடம் பயில நியாயமான வாய்ப்பு அளிக்கவேண்டும். தமிழன் என்ற முறையில், ஒருவனுக்கு இந்தி படித்துப் பயன் இல்லை என்று தோன்றுமானால் அவன் ஆங்கிலம் மட்டுமே படித்துத் தமிழிலே சிறப்பான அறிவு பெற விரும்பினாலும் அந்த வாய்ப்பு அளிக்கப்பட வேண்டும். அப்போதுதான் இந்தி விருப்பப் பாடம் என்ற நிலை பிறக்கும். இந்திப் பரீட்சை தேர்வு கேலிக்

[திரு. க. அன்பழகன்] [28th March 1963

கூத்தாக இருக்கிறது என்று கல்வி அமைச்சர் தேர்வு நடத்துவதை நிறுத்தினார்கள். மத்திய அரசினர் இச் செயலைக் கண்டிக்கவே துணிந்துவிட்டனர். இந்தித் தேர்வு எழுதாவிட்டால் ஆசிரியருக்கு மரியாதை கிடைக்குமா என்று சிலர் கேட்கிறார்கள். இந்தித் தேர்வு நடத்தியே ஆகவேண்டும் என்ற மத்திய அரசின் ஆணைக்கு அடங்கி, அமைச்சர் தேர்வு வைக்க முற்பட்டு விட்டார்கள். ஆனாலும், இந்தியைக் கட்டாயப்படுத்துவதை தமிழ் மக்கள் ஏற்க மாட்டார்கள் என்று மத்திய அரசினருக்குச் சொல்கிற அமைச்சர் அதையே செயல்படுத்தும் முறையில், விரும்புகிறவர்கள் இந்தி படிக்கிறார்கள், விரும்பாதவர்களுக்கு தாய்மொழியையே படிக்க வாய்ப்பு அளித்திருக்கிறோம் என்று தெரிவிப்பார்களேயானால் அது தமிழ்நாட்டு மக்களை அவர்களுடைய மனக் குறையிலிருந்து, நிச்சயமாக நிம்மதி அடையச் செய்யும். இரண்டு மொழி படித்தால் போதும் என்ற கொள்கை கூட ஏற்கெனவே இந்த அரசினரால் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டுள்ள ஒன்றுதான். மற்ற மொழிகளான சமஸ்கிருதம் முதலியவற்றை விரும்புவோர் படிக்கலாம். சமஸ்கிருதத்தில் ஏரோப்ளேன் விமானம் செய்வதற்கான திறன் இருக்கிறதா இல்லையா என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியாது. ஆனால் சமஸ்கிருதத்தை விரும்பினால் எவரும் படிக்கலாம். கட்டாயமாக அந்த மொழியைப் படிக்க வேண்டிய அவசியமில்லை. ஆனால் ஹிந்தி மொழிப்பாடம் கட்டாயம் ஆகிறது.

4-40 p.m. அமைச்சர் அவர்கள், முதலில் பேசுகையில் மத்திய சர்க்காரிலே உள்ள அலுவல்களில் இடம் பெறுவதற்கு விரும்புகிறவர்கள் பின்னாலே இந்தியிலே தகுதி பெறுவதற்கு முன்னாலே விரும்பிப் படிப்பது உதவியாக இருக்கும் என்றும் ஒரு கருத்தைத் தெரிவித்தார்கள். ஆனால் அப்படி ஆசைகாட்டி இந்தியைப் புகுத்துவதிலே இருக்கிற சில ஆபத்தையும் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இன்றையச் செய்தித்தாளில் வந்த கருத்து, மத்திய சர்க்கார் உள்துறை அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் மத்திய சர்க்கார் அலுவலாளர் தேர்வுக்கு இதுகாறும் ஆங்கிலத்தில் போட்டித்தேர்வு எழுதுபவர்கள் இனி இந்தியிலும் எழுதலாம் என்ற ஆணை பிறப்பிப்பதற்கான முயற்சியில் அரசாங்கம் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கிறது, எனவும், முன்னாள் குடியரசுத் தலைவர் ஆணையின்படியும், கருத்தின்படியும், இந்தியில் எழுதுதற்கு அனுமதிக்கும் ஆணையைத் தக்க சமயத்தில் வெளியிடுவது பற்றி யோசித்துக் கொண்டுள்ளோம் எனவும், விரைவில் வெளியிடுவோம் என்றும் தெரிவித்து இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தியை —மத்திய அலுவல் போட்டித்தேர்வு எழுத அனுமதிப்பது, அதன் ஆதிக்கத்தையே காட்டும். இந்நிலையில், ‘இந்தியை விரும்புகிறவர்கள் படிக்கிறார்கள், மற்றவர்களுக்கு நாங்கள் கட்டாயப் படுத்தவில்லை, கட்டாயப்படுத்துகிற முறையில் எதையும் செய்ய மாட்டோம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டே போட்டித் தேர்வுக்கு இந்தியைக்கொண்டு வருகின்றனர். அனைவரும் ஆங்கிலத்தில் தேர்வு எழுதுவதனால் பதினான்கு தேசீய மொழி பேசும் மக்களிடையே போட்டியின் விளைவில் ஏற்றத்தாழ்வுகள் ஏற்பட இடமிருக்காது. இந்தியிலே எழுதலாம் என்று

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

அனுமதித்து விடுவார்களானல் இந்தியில் எழுதுகிறவர்களுக்குக் கிட்டுகிற சலுகைகள் மற்றவர்களுக்குக் கிடைக்காது. அதிலும் குறிப்பாக தமிழ், தெலுங்கு, மலையாளம், முதலான மொழி மக்கள் தமது தாய்மொழியில் அந்தத் தேர்வு எழுத முடியாது என்பது அதை விடக் கொடுமை. இதைவிட தென்னகத்து மக்களுக்கு இழைக்கப்படுகிற அநீதி வேறு எதுவும் இருக்கமுடியாது. இந்த நிலையில் நமது மக்களும் இந்தி படித்துள்ளார்கள் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ள இந்தியைப் பள்ளிகளில் புகுத்துவது இந்தி ஆதிக்கம் வளரவே துணைசெய்யும்.

நமது குழந்தைகளுக்கு தமிழ்தான் தாய் மொழி, முதல் மொழி, அவர்கள் இரண்டாவது பாட மொழி நேரத்தில் நமது தாய் மொழியையே சிறப்பு மொழியாகப் படிப்ப தற்கு அரசாங்கம் வாய்ப்பு ஏற்படுத்தி ஆகவேண்டும்.

மற்றென்றும் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரிவித்த ஒரு பதிலில் கூட, "முதலமைச்சர்களின் கொள்கைப்படி இங்கு ஹிந்தி மொழி கட்டாயம் ஆகாது. எங்கள் கொள்கைப்படி அது விருப்பப் பாட மாக இருக்கிறது. எந்த நிலையிலும் இந்தியைக் கட்டாய மொழி யாக ஆக்க முடியாது என்றும், பள்ளிகளில் அது விருப்பப் பாடமாகவே இருக்கும்" என்றும் தெரிவித்து இருக்கிறார்கள். எந்த நிலையிலும் கட்டாயம் ஆக்க மாட்டோம் என்று சொல்லி இருக்கிறது அங்கே. அந்தக் கருத்தை மனச்சான்றோடு நிறைவேற்ற வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். சொன்ன கருத்தை நிறைவேற்றும்போது ஹிந்தி படிக்க விரும் பாத குழந்தைகளுக்கு வேறுமொழிப் பாடம் படிப்பதற்கு வாய்ப்புத் தரவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். மேலும் அந்த பதிலில் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கு ஆசை காட்டி, 54 ஆயிரம் பேர் எஸ்.எஸ்.எல்.சி. தேர்வு எழுதினர்கள் அதிலே 80 சத விகிதம் ஹிந்தியை விருப்பப்பாடமாக எடுத்தார் கள் என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். எந்த நிலையிலே எடுத்தார்கள்? வேறு வாய்ப்பு அளித்ததற்குப் பின்னலே எடுத்தார்களா? Craft பயிற்சி முறைக்கு வாய்ப்பு அளித்ததற்குப் பின்னல் இந்தி எடுத்தார்களா? அல்லது இவர்கள் அத்தனை பேரும் அந்த மொழி யில் தேர்ச்சி பெறுகிற அளவுக்கு அறிவு பெற்றார்களா, அல்லது வாழ்வுக்குப் பயன்படுகிற அளவுக்காவது கற்க முடிந்ததா? அமைச்சருக்கு இந்த நிலை தெரியாதா? இந்நிலையில் மறுபடியும் 'இந்தி'யில் தேர்வு எழுதவேண்டும் என்று திட்டம் கொண்டு வருவதும் அதை Moderation-க்குப் பயன் படுத்திக் கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுவதும் தமிழ் நாட்டுப்பிள்ளைகளுக்குச் செய்திருக்கிற மாபெரும் தீங்கு ஆகும். அதைக் கல்வி நிபுணர் கள் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டிருந்தாலும் நான் ஏற்பதற்கில்லை. இந்த Moderation-முறை இந்தியைக் கட்டாயப்படுத்தித் திணிக்கத் தூண்டிலாக உதவும். ஹிந்தி எண்கள் மாடரேஷனுக்கு ஏற்கப் படும் என்று சொன்னல் இந்தி தேர்வு எழுதுகிற மாணவர் களுக்கு 100-க்கு 70 பேர்கள் சாதாரண மதிப்பீடு பெறுகிற தகுதி உடையவர்களுக்கு ஹிந்தியை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுவதை ஊக்குவிப்

[திரு. க. அன்பழகன்] [28th March 1963

பதற்காக 100-க்கு 80, 70, என எண்கள் மதிப்பீடு வழங்கும் முறை ஏற்படும். அப்படி அவர்கள் எண்கள் (Marks) பெறக் கூடிய நிலையில் படிக்க வேண்டிய அவசியமான பாடத்திலும் தவறு இழைத்து படிக்கத் தேவையில்லாத பாடத்தில் அதிக எண்கள் பெற்று படிக்க வேண்டிய பாடத்தில் குறைகிற எண்களுக்கு அதனை ஈடு செய்வது, முறையற்றதாகும். படிக்க வேண்டிய பாட அறிவைப் பெறுவது குறையவும், தேர்வு முறையில் தவறான மனப் பான்மையை உண்டாக்கி இந்திக்கு செல்வாக்கு ஏற்படவும் இது காரணமாகும் என்று நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

கனம் திரு. எம். பக்தவத்சலம் : Moderation - முறை பழைய முறை.

திரு. க. அன்பழகன் : அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் Moderation - முறை பழைய முறை என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். படிக்க வேண்டிய நான்கு பாடங்களான, தமிழ், ஆங்கிலம், கணக்கு, விஞ்ஞானம் முதலானவற்றுள் ஒன்றில் ஏற்படும் குறைவை—மற்றொன்றில் பெறும் எண்ணைக்கொண்டு தேர்வில் Moderation செய்வதே பழைய முறை. அதை நான் புரிந்து கொள்ள முடியும். கட்டாயம் இல்லாத பாடத்தில் பெறுகிற எண்களைக் கொண்டு கட்டாயப்படுத்தப்பட்டுள்ள பாடத்தில் உள்ள குறைவுக்கு ஈடு செய்வது, அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டு தேர்வு முடிவு செய்வது குறையையே உண்டாக்கும். இந்த முறையை நிச்சய மாக மாற்றிக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

அடுத்து இந்தப் புதிய திட்டத்தில் மூன்று மொழிக் கொள்கை யையும்—அதன் பயனையும் ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்கவேண்டும். மற்ற மாநிலங்களில் மூன்று மொழி வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொன்னால் அந்த மூன்று மொழிகளுள் ஆங்கிலத்தைத் தவிர, மற்ற இருமொழிகளும் ஒன்றுடன் ஒன்று தொடர்புடையவை. ஓரியாவும், ஹிந்தியும்; குஜராத்தியும், ஹிந்தியும்; பஞ்சாபியும் ஹிந்தியும் போன்றவை. ஆனால் இந்தியுடன் தொடர்பில்லாத மொழி தமிழ். எனவே ஹிந்தியும் தமிழும் படிப்பது என்பது மிகவும் கடினம். மேலும் அந்த மொழிகள் தமிழைப்போல இலக்கியவளம் பெற்ற (Classical Language) மொழிகள் அல்ல. தமிழ் மொழி உண்மையாகவே மக்களுடைய இன்றைய பேச்சு மொழி மட்டுமல்ல. பண்டைய இலக்கிய மொழி இலக்கிய வளம் பெற்ற கலைத் திறன்மிக்க, காலத்திற்கும் வளரக்கூடிய தமிழ் மொழியை, பிற மொழியிலிருந்து மாறுபட்டு, தனித்து நிற்கும் மொழியைப் படிக்க வேண்டிய மாணவன்—மூன்றாவது மொழியும் படிக்கத்தான் வேண்டும் என்பது முறையல்ல. மொழி களைக் கற்கும் முயற்சியையும் ஒப்பு நோக்குகிறபோது, வடமா நிலத்தவர் மூன்று மொழிகள் படிப்பதும் நமது தமிழ்க் குழந்தை கள் இரண்டு மொழி படிப்பதும் சமமாகும். இந்நிலையில் மூன்று மொழித் திட்டத்தின் பெயராலே மூன்றாவது மொழியும் படித்தாக வேண்டும் என்று கட்டாயப் படுத்த அவசியமில்லை. விரும்புகிற வர்களுக்கு மட்டுமே இந்திப் படிப்பு என்று அமைக்க வேண்டும்.

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இங்கு சொன்ன கருத்துப்படியே மொழி அறிவு புலமை பெறுவது ஒன்று. சிந்திக்கும் திறனுள்ள அறிவு, நுண்ணறிவு, விஞ்ஞான அறிவு பெறுவது மற்றொன்று. அப்படிப் பார்க்கும்பொழுது ஹிந்தி மொழி அறிவை பெயர் அளவுக்குப் பெறுவதால் பயனில்லை. யாவருக்கும் அறிவு இயல்பாக வளர வேண்டுமானால் அவருடைய தாய் மொழி தான் பயன் படுகிறது. அடுத்து விஞ்ஞானத் துறையில் அறிவு பெறுவதற்குத் துணை நிற்கும் மொழியாக உள்ளது ஆங்கிலம் தான். அந்த இரண்டு மொழிதவிர வேறு எந்த மொழியாக இருந்தாலும், பெயர் அளவுக்குப் படிக்கிற மொழியாக உள்ள நிலையில் கட்டாயப்படுத்துவதைக் கைவிடவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

இப்பொழுது வருகிற இந்தத் திருத்தத்தில் புதிய 8-வது வகுப்பு வருகிறது. இது இப்பொழுது வரவிருக்கிற ஓராண்டுப் பெருக்க திட்டத்தாலே. இப்பொழுது 10 ஆண்டுக்கல்வியாக இருப்பது பதினோராண்டுக் கல்வியாகிறது. ஒரு வகுப்பை உயர் நிலைப்பள்ளியின் உச்சத்தில் சேர்க்க வேண்டுமென்று தீர்மானித்து, **(Higher Secondary Course)** ஹையர் செகண்டரி வகுப்பு ஏற்படுத்தும் திட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தனர். முன்பு பத்து ஆண்டுகல்வி முறைப்படி குழந்தைகள் 6 வயதுக்கு மேல் கட்டாயமாகப் படிக்க வேண்டும் என்று முன்னர் கொண்ட முடிவை இப்பொழுது 5 வயதுக்கு மேல் என்று ஏற்க வேண்டும். அப்பொழுது பள்ளிப்படிப்பு ஆறு வயதில் தொடங்கினால், இப்பொழுது 5 வயதில் தொடங்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் பயிற்சியில் சேர்க்கப்பட்டுள்ள ஓராண்டுக்கு வயதை ஈடுசெய்ய முடியும். இப்பொழுது புதிதாக வரும் 8-வது வகுப்புக்கு ஏற்கனவே 7-வது வகுப்பில் தேறியவர்கள் வர இருக்கிறார்கள். மூன்றாவது பாரத்தில் படித்தவர்கள் 9-வது ஸ்டாண்டர்டு வகுப்புக்கு வருகிறார்கள். 7-வது ஸ்டாண்டர்டு பாடம் மூன்றாவது பாரத்தின் பாடத்தைவிட கடுமையானதாக இருக்கிறது என்று நான் அறிகிறேன். எனவே 3-வது பாரத்தையும் 7-வது வகுப்பையும் ஒருநிலைப் படுத்துமளவுக்கு பாடத்திட்டத்திலே இடமிருக்கிறதா என்று ஒப்பு நோக்க வேண்டும், பரிசீலிக்கவேண்டும் என்று குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். இவை எல்லாவற்றையும் விட 7-வது ஸ்டாண்டர்டு வகுப்பிலே சென்ற ஆண்டிலே 3-வது பாரத்தில் இடம் இல்லாதவர்கள் பலர் சேர்க்கப்பட்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். மூன்றாவது பாரத்தில் இடம் இல்லாத காரணத்தினாலே இப்பொழுது 7-வது வகுப்பில் சேர்ந்து கொள்பவர்கள் அதில் வெற்றி பெற்றபின் நேற்றைய எட்டாவது வகுப்பில் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளப் படுவர் என்ற நம்பிக்கையுடன் சேர்க்கப்பட்டுள்ளனர். 3-வது பாரத்தில் படிக்க வேண்டியவர்களையே உயர் நிலைப் பள்ளிகளில் இடவசதி இல்லாதவிடத்து, 7-வது ஸ்டாண்டர்டில் சேர்த்துக் கொண்டுள்ளனர். அப்படி சென்னையில் உள்ள பல உயர்நிலைப் பள்ளிகளில் 2-வது ஃபாரம் தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற பிறகு 7-வது படி நிலை வகுப்பில் சேர்க்கப்பட்ட மாணவர்கள் இருக்கின்றனர். பல உயர் நிலைப் பள்ளிகளில் இரண்டாவது ஃபாரம் தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற பிறகு ஏழாவது வகுப்பில் படிக்கிற மாணவர்களுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளித்து புதிய எட்டாவது வகுப்புக்கு மேற்பட்ட வகுப்பில் 4–50 p.m.

சேரும் வழிவகை செய்தால்தான் அவர்கள் மட்டும் 12 ஆண்டுகள் படிக்கவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்படாது என்று தெரிவித்துக்கொள் கிறேன்.

அடுத்து தெரிவிக்க விரும்புவது, ஆதாரக் கல்வி பற்றியது. இந்தக் கருத்து அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொண்ட கருத் தாகும். ஆதாரக்கல்வி பயன்படாத நிலையில் தொழிற்கல்வியை எந்த நிலையில் மாணவர்கள் படிப்போடு புகுத்துவது என்று சிந்திக்கவேண்டும். ஐந்தாவது வகுப்பில் படிக்கிற பிள்ளைகள் உழவுத்தொழில், பயிர் இவைபற்றிய கருத்துக்களை அந்த வகுப்புக் களில் பெற்றாகவேண்டும். 8-வது வகுப்புவரையில் படிக்கிற பிள்ளைகள் அந்தக் காலத்திற்குள் ஏதாவது ஒரு கைத்தொழிலை, பின்னர் தொழில் கல்விக்குச் சென்றாலும் பயன்படும் கல்வியைப் பெற்றாகவேண்டும். 25 ஆண்டுகளுக்கு முன்பு தமிழ் நாட்டுக் கல்விக்கூடங்களில் நெசவுத் தொழில் வகுப்பும், மர தச்சு வேலை வகுப்பும் நடத்தப்பட்டன. அந்த முறையில் 8-வது வகுப்பு, தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற பின்னர் தொழில் கல்வியில் ஈடுபட விரும்பினால் தொழிற்கல்விப் பள்ளியாக உள்ள ஜூனியர் டெக்னிகல் பள்ளி கள், முதலானவற்றில் சேருவதற்கு வாய்ப்பு பெறுகின்ற வகையில் தொழிற் கல்வியில் ஆர்வம் உண்டாகுமாறு பயிற்சி ஏற்படுத்தப் படவேண்டும்.

அடுத்து மேல் நிலை வகுப்புக்களைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் இப்போது வரலாறும், நிலவியலும் கற்றற்குரியபாடமாக குறிப் பிட்டிருந்தார்கள். தேர்வுக்கு வைக்க வேண்டுமானால் அதை விருப்பப்பாடமாகக் கொண்டு தேர்வு எழுதலாம் என்று கூறி விருப்பத்தேர்வுக்கு உரியதாக்கினால் பாடம் வைக்கும் நோக்கம் செம்மை பெறாது என்று கருதுகிறேன். இயல்பாகப் படித்து எழுத வேண்டிய பாடமாக வரலாறும் நிலவியலும் இருக்க வேண்டும். மேலும் பாடத்திட்டங்களை மாற்றியமைக்கும் முறை சீர்தூக்கிப் பரிசீலிக்கப்படவேண்டும். அத்துடன் ஆப்ஷனல் ஆகிய சிறப்புப்பாடங்களில், ஃபிசிக்ஸ், கெமிஸ்ட்ரி, பையாலஜி போன்ற விஞ்ஞானப்பாடங்கள் அமைத்திருப்பது பொருத்தமற்ற தாகத் தோன்றுகிறது. போதுமான விஞ்ஞானக் கூடங் கள் பள்ளிகளில் இல்லாத காரணத்தால், முன்னதாக ஏற்படுத்த திட்டமிட்ட ஹையர் செகண்டரி வகுப்புக் கள் ஏற்படுத்தமுடியவில்லை என்ற காரணத்தை அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் தெரிவித்திருக்கிறார்கள். 100-க்கு 75 பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் விஞ்ஞானப்பயிற்சிக் கூடங்கள் இல்லை. அப்படிப்பட்ட பள்ளிகள் பெரும்பாலானவையாக இருக்கும்போது ஃபிசிக்ஸ், கெமிஸ்ட்ரி, பையாலஜி போன்ற பாடங்களைப் படிக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் சில நகரங்களில் உள்ள உயர்தரமான பள்ளிகளில் இடம் கிடைப்ப வர்கள் மட்டுமே படிக்க முடியும். மாவட்ட ஆட்சி மன்றத்தால் நடத்தப் படுகின்ற கிராமப் பகுதிகளிலுள்ள உயர் நிலைப்பள்ளி களுக்கு ஆராய்ச்சிக்கூடங்கள் மட்டுமல்ல. கட்டிடங்களே கிடையாது. பல மாணவர்கள் இதனால் வேறு பாடங்களைத் தான் ஏற்க நேரிடும். லாபரட்டரி இல்லாமல் விஞ்ஞானப்பாடம் எப்படி கற்றுத்தரமுடியும்? என்று சிந்திக்கவேண்டும். சிறப்புப் பாடங்களில் ஒரு பாடத்தை மட்டும் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் ஏற்றுக்

28th March 1963] [திரு. க. அன்பழகன்]

கொண்டு, இரண்டு பாடமாக வைப்பதை நிறுத்திக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். ஒரே ஒரு சிறப்புப் பாடம் தொடங்குவது நலம். அதுவும் பரவலாக இருக்கவேண்டும். அதற்கேற்ற முறையில் பள்ளிக்கூடங்கள் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டு விஞ்ஞானக்கூடங்களுக்கான நிதி ஒதுக்கித்தந்து கட்டச் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

ஏறத்தாழ ஒன்பதாவது வகுப்பு அளவில் ஓரளவு பொதுஅறிவு பெறுவதற்கான வாய்ப்பிருக்கிறது. எனவே 10, 11 வகுப்புக்களில் பயிலும்போது வேலைக்கான துணைப் பயிற்சி அளிப்பது நல்லது. பைபர்கேட்டட் கோர்ஸ் என்ற முறையில் இன்சினியரிங், விவசாயம், செக்ரடேரியல் பயிற்சி முதலானவற்றில் இப்பொழுது 30 வகுப்புகள் மட்டுமே தொடங்கப்பெற்றிருக்கின்றன என்று அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் தெரிவித்தார்கள். அது குறைவு பைஃபர் கேட்டட் கோர்ஸ் என்று சொல்கிறபோது இரண்டாண்டில் பெறும் அந்தப் பயிற்சி வேலைக்கேற்ற முழுப் பயிற்சியாக இருக்க வேண்டும். நெசவு வேலையாக இருக்கலாம், மர வேலையாக இருக்க லாம். ஆசிரியர் பயிற்சியாகக் கூட இருக்கலாம். கிளார்க் வேலைக்குச் செல்வதற்கான புக்-கீப்பிங், போன்ற செகரடேரியட் கோர்சாக இருக்கலாம். அந்த அறிவு முழு அளவாக வேலைக்குச் செல்லக்கூடிய வகையில் அளிக்கப்படவேண்டும். 30 வகுப்புக் களே அமைக்கப்பட்டிருப்பது மிகப்பெரிய அளவில் விரிவாக்கப் படவேண்டும். 1,700, 1,300 உயர்நிலைப் பள்ளிகள் இருக்கின்றன என்றால் 700 அல்லது 800 பள்ளிகளில் மாணவர்களை கல்லூரிக்குச் செல்லவேண்டிய அவசியமான நிலையினின்றும் விலகுதற்கு ஏது வாக இன்னொரு பகுதியில் பயிற்சி பெற்று அந்தப் படிப்பு முடிந்த வுடன் வேலைக்குச் செல்லும் முறையில் அமைக்கவேண்டும், என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். ஜூனியர் டெக்னிகல் ஸ்கூல், 10, 12 என்ற அளவில் திறக்கப்படுமானால் கல்வித்துறையில் ஏற்படுகிற நெருக் கடியை நீக்கிவிடாது. நூற்றுக் கணக்கில் திறக்கப்படவேண்டும். உயர்நிலைப்பள்ளி நான்குக்கு ஒன்று என்ற விதத்தில் அமைந்தால் தான் தொழில் வளர்ச்சிக்கு ஏற்றமுறையில் இயங்கமுடியும். மாணவர்களுக்கும் ஆர்வம் ஏற்படமுடியும். கல்வி முடிந்த பிறகு வேலையைத் தேடிக்கொண்டு அலைகின்ற பரிதாப நிலைமையும் சிறிது நீங்கும்.

அடுத்து, அரசாங்கத்தின் கல்விமானிய கோரிக்கை மொழிப் பெயர்ப்பில் எவ்வளவோ தடுமாற்றங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. நான் மொழி பெயர்ப்பு வேலையைக் குறை சொல்வதற்காக இதைக் குறிக்கவில்லை. 'தெளிவு' குறையக்கூடாது என்பதற்கே இந்தக் கல்விக் கோரிக்கையைக் குறிப்பிட்டுச் சொல்ல விரும்பு கிறேன். டிடெய்ல்டு ஸ்டடி, நான்டிடெய்ல்டு ஸ்டடி என்று ஆங்கிலத்தில் இருப்பதற்கு விரிவான ஆங்கிலப் புத்தகம், விரிவில் லாத ஆங்கிலப் புத்தகம் என்று மொழி பெயர்க்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. தமிழுக்கு ஆக்கம் தேடுகின்ற அரசாங்கம் இதுபோன்று நிகழ் கின்ற குறைகளைக் களையவேண்டும். அரசாங்கம் வெளியிடுகின்ற பாடபுத்தகங்களில் ஓரிரு பக்கத்தில் ஏறக்குறைய 50, 60 பிழை களுக்குமேல் ஓரிரு தமிழ் புத்தகங்களில் இருக்கின்றன. காரணம் என்னவென்று பார்த்தால் இன்றையதினம் அச்சிட்டு வெளியிடு

[திரு. க. அன்பழகன்] [28th March 1963

கின்ற அரசாங்கத்தின் அச்சகத்தில் பிழைபார்க்கின்ற .கடமையைச் செய்பவர்கள் புலவர் தகுதி பெற்றவர்கள் ஒருவர் இருவர் கூட இல்லை. எஸ்.எஸ்.எல்.சி., படித்தவர்கள், தமிழ் ஏடுகளிலுள்ள எழுத்துப் பிழைகளைக் காணமுடியாத அளவில் உள்ளவர்கள் பெரும்பாலானவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அதை நீக்க தமிழுக்கு ஆக்கம் தருவதாகக் கூறுகிற அரசாங்கம் பிழை நீக்குகின்ற வேலையைப் புலவர்களுக்கு அளிக்க முன்வரவேண்டும். அதற்கு அவர்களில் சிலர் நியமிக்கப்படவேண்டும். அந்த வேலையில் அப்படிப் பட்ட தகுதி உள்ளவர்கள் இருந்தால் இந்தப் பிழைகள் தமிழ்ப் புத்தகங்களில் வராது என்பது என் கருத்து. தமிழ் ஏடுகள் ஏராளமாக வெளிவரவும் அரசாங்கம் வழிகாணவேண்டும். கல்லூரிக்குரிய 62-புத்தகங்கள்தான் வந்திருக்கின்றன என்பது பெருங்குறை. உயர்தரக் கல்வி எப்படியும் தமிழில் வந்து தான் ஆக வேண்டும் என்ற காரணத்தால் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இதற்கு ஆதரவு தரவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, தமிழ் வளரவும் கல்விமொழியாகவும், ஆட்சி மொழியாகவும் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் முன்வந்து காரியங்கள் செய்வார்கள் என்று எதிர் நோக்கி, என்னுடைய உரையை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

(Deputy Chairman in the chair.)

* SRI M. RAJAH IYER : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a momentous occasion when we have to express our views on the pattern of education placed before us by the Hon. the Minister for Finance. To the extent that he has consulted the teaching opinion regarding the duration of the course, our thanks are whole-heartedly due to him. I wish I could say the same thing of every detail in the pattern.

Regarding the curricular content, there are many aspects that have taken many by surprise. I would refer to them later. Regarding the duration, Sir, it is well that the eight year primary course is thought of as a terminal stage. At the end of the VIII Standard pupils could opt to the lower technical course, vocational course and take up their place in life. It is a happy feature indeed that the teacher training is not thought of as a technical course available at that stage. It is a sentiment that has often been expressed on the floor of this House that the VIII Standard qualification is too poor a general qualification for one who would be a teacher of the young. It has been conceded by the Hon. Minister in particular and I hope it will be implemented early. The three year secondary course which comes after the primary course makes the children fit for life. It is from that angle that the Government have to view the Secondary course, as a preparation for life and not as a preparation for the University stage. That should be the aim of secondary education.

Sir, this year we are told that about 90 thousand candidates are sitting for and writing their S.S.L.C. examination. Many of them would get through the examination quite successfully too. There is no scope for all of them to enter the colleges. Most of them enter life and take their place straightway. Our national character

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Rajah Iyer]

is judged by the basic equipment of these people and it is well that we are giving them a eleven year course so that they may take their place in life and do their work quite properly and efficiently. That is why teachers' organizations in one voice have been pleading for a eleven year course. It was suggested that a ten year secondary course and then a two year university course and then a three year degree course might better serve the interest of university education. It might be better from the point of view of University education but it would be a poor arrangement from the point of view of the school leavers. We have to view the whole thing from the point of view of the school leavers. The objection that is raised to the eleven year course is that while pupils are doing eleven years here, their brothers elsewhere in the north are enabled to leave the school at the end of the tenth year. This one year's disparity has been there all along. While in 14 years one can take a degree in the north, in Madras we have always been devoting 15 years, eleven in school and four years in the college before one can take a degree. To that extent, it gave our graduates a much better foundation and a much better grasp of things, and maturity and ability to do quite well in the competitive examinations than those in the north. But what will happen now? What was an advantage to our boys all these years must not become a disadvantage by this arrangement. That is my anxiety. I fear in competitive examinations where there is a very rigid age-limit saying that you shall not enter the Central Services if your age is so and so, might weigh quite heavily with our boys. Of course, one way out was suggested by the hon. Member Sri Anbazhagan just now saying that we would take our children into the schools a year earlier. But I fear it is not a sound educational principle. Already we feel that children are being put to school too early because they are not obliged to adduce any specific proof of age. Five plus must be the age, or six should be the age of admission. An earlier age cannot be thought of in the interest of sound education. So we must do everything in our power to prevent little children, the tiny tots coming into school before that age. If the parents want to put them in school, they have the pre-school training for which ample scope is provided with Thayis and women teachers. That is more an experience that the children get there than any formal education that they get in schools. Formal education as such cannot begin before one is six years old. If one enters the school at age of six, he will take his degree at the age of 21 after 15 years of school and college education or a post-graduate degree at the age of 23, and without that he cannot make a mark in the All-India Competitive examinations. So, this Government should do everything in their power to influence the Centre to relax the rules regarding the age-limit in the case of Madras Graduates because he will be 23 when a student in this State can take his post-graduate degree. Even as they have relaxed the age rule for the socially and educationally backward people, they can relax the age rule in respect of graduates from our State. If this is done, I do hope that our graduates, young men and women that come out of our colleges will not suffer, because they

5-00 p.m.

have to put this extra year. It is also said, Sir, that education becomes costly because we have one more year. Now we are committed to a policy of free universal and compulsory education. So, cost does not come in there. From every point of view this eleven year school course must be considered to be a sound course which should be welcomed by every one having the interest of the children at heart. This should be implemented straightway.

Sir, the hon. Member Sri Anbazhagan referred to the fact that there were certain hard cases where second form boys after passing the Second Form were admitted into the VII Standard by mistake last year. It was quite an irregularity. There was no justification or authority for any one to do so. But in the state of affairs then prevailing we took very many things for granted. It only shows how dangerous it is to anticipate things in matters pertaining to education pattern. If they had stuck to the rules, they had no authority to put a Second Form passed boy again into the VII Standard. But if he is now pushed up to the IX Standard, it would lead to a number of attendant problems. There is the VII Standard boy who has passed the Second Form and admitted into the VII Standard due to no fault of his, but due to organizational difficulties. He is there anyhow and he has been there for the full year, completed the course and by virtue of having passed the second form in the previous year if he is now pushed into the IX Standard, consider the case of a brilliant student who has scored very well in the very examination that those children sat and wrote. It would be unjust to say: "You shall remain here however more brilliant you may be than the boy who goes to the IX Standard", simply because he had passed the examinaation in the second form in the previous year. I would like to go with the hon. Member Sri Anbazhagan at least half the way. The VII Standard syllabus, as he rightly pointed out, is in no way inferior to the third form syllabus. We want the VII Standard students to do one more year before they go to the first year of the secondary course. We may send round a circular that no student shall be detained in the VII Standard this year however poor his record in the school examination might be. He should be automatically sent to the eighth year of the study which he has earned by virtue knowledge subjects more easily, more naturally and more quickly To that extent it may be a welcome relief to the children.

Sir, the question of medium of instruction has been a vexed problem. The Hon. Minister has rightly referred to the fact that the regional language should ultimately be the most natural and easy medium of instruction. But it is very unfortunate that there should still be a controversy theoretically regarding the medium of instruction at any stage, be it the secondary stage or the University stage. I cannot think of any expert committee report that makes a plea for a foreign language as medium of instruction even at the University stage and under any circumstances. Theoretically that proposition has got to be accepted. Dr. Radhakrishnan Commission report referred to the fact that a foreign medium is quite unsound as a medium of instruction even at the University

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Rajah Iyer]

stage. Then, Sir, our Vice-Chancellors met in Bombay in February last. They have passed a unanimous resolution that the replacement of English by the regional languages as medium of instruction at the University stage is inevitable. It is a resolution every word of which has got to be underlined. But it was added that there were so many preconditions that have got to be ensured before any such switch over could be thought of. That caution 5-10 p.m. administered by them has got to be borne in mind. They almost endorse the very sound and very cautious policy that has been announced by the Hon. Minister in the note that has just been circulated to us. The ultimate idea is to make the regional language the medium of instruction. But for that we require books, we require teachers and lecturers who will handle the subject with some confidence in themselves in the language in which they come forward to teach. We also require parents who would put their children into such schools and students also must be prepared to come forward without the extra incentive such as scholarships, fee concessions, stipends. Above all we should dispel the prejudice that education through the English medium is something superior to education through the Tamil medium. As one who has been a working teacher all these years, I cannot think of a greater myth than that. If the mastery of general knowledge alone is to be taken into consideration, a pupil who receives his education through his mother-tongue will be able to master the general knowledge subjects more easily, more naturally and more quickly than any other brother of his, who is straining under the thraldom of a foreign language.

(Mr. Chairman in the chair.)

But at the same time, a boy who studies his general knowledge subjects in the mother-tongue gets his mental faculties released to study English as a subject—as a language—much better. So, I would urge that in the interest of the spread of English, in the interest of mastery of English as a language, we must insist upon the general knowledge subjects being taught in the regional language at the secondary stage as has been rightly emphasised by the Hon. Minister. To say this is not to say that we are against English. Everybody realises the importance of English. The confusion, as was rightly pointed out, is due to the fact that we oftentimes mistake the medium of instruction with the language that has got to be studied. I cannot think of a more telling incident than the one that appeared recently in the press. The other day the Hon. American Ambassador, when he arrived in Madras, was asked a question by one of our press reporters as to what he thought about English being the medium of instruction. His reply was that he had never found his knowledge of English a misfortune. It is a sentiment in which he has the wholehearted agreement of every protaganist of Tamil as a medium of instruction. Even in schools and colleges we never found a knowledge of English to be a misfortune. To put it positively, it is great good fortune that we could inherit this precious heritage. In order to make the study of this English language worthwhile, we must see

[Sri M. Rajah Iyer] [28th March 1963

that the mental faculties of the children are released to master English as a language and that has been rightly done by starting the study of English from the III Standard itself and making Tamil the medium of instruction except where there is a felt need for students whose mother-tongue is not Tamil and who still feel more at home in English than in the regional language.

Coming to the curriculum, Sir, there is a feeling that, as it is printed in the paper, it is very impressive. It is something that promises to be a blue print for a new era of education. But it is calculated to be very heavy. There are a number of attendant problems that have to be carefully worked out. The Hon. Minister pointed out that all this period of uncertainty must end, and that there had been too much of experimentation in the field of education. It is an unfortunate state of affairs. We share his feeling of disappointment. But, at the same time, we are anxious that the new experiment must also be done after a lot of planning. We cannot dispense with experimentation altogether in education. Unless we experiment, we cannot progress. We will be static. We have to experiment. Under controlled conditions, the experiments have to be conducted. There is satisfaction in the hearts of very many that the two optionals are coming back. But, if we go deeper into the question, we will see that they are coming back today in quite a different set of conditions altogether. Prior to 1929 when the scheme of education was in force under which we, belonging to the older generation, received our education, we had two optionals no doubt. In those days among the subjects English was the most important subject and it had the pride of place as the first language and the other language subject was contemptuously called the vernacular. Apart from these two languages where too English dominated (a little Tamil was also taught) there was general mathematics. With these three subjects, two electives could very well go. That generation of students was drawn from the intellectual aristocracy of the day. They had very good environmental facilities at home. They were drawn from the middle class society. If they could have such a light curriculum, no wonder they had all the advantages at their disposal. They were the leaders of the society. They mastered their subjects and they have taken their place in society, a place they rightly deserved. But after 1929, we did away with one of the optionals. In the place of two optionals, we introduced one optional and tried to make our curriculam more and more broad-based. There were languages and three core subjects—Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. Social Studies may be called history and geography. Up to 1948 they had the languages, three core subjects and one optional After 1948, even this one optional was done away with not because the optional subject or elective subject, as it is called, was unnecessary, but because they thought they could give depth to the curriculum by bringing all these under general knowledge subjects, that experiment had worked all these years. To-day, if we evolve a pattern —the pattern that is before us—we must assess the results that have accrued from this particular pattern and we must take into account the criticisms that have been levelled against the old pattern of

28th March 1963] [Sri M. Rajah Iyer]

education. It used to be said of the old system of education that we received, that there was absolutely no general knowledge for the boys, that they did not know any history or geography and so on. It used to be a standing, stock argument and it was an argument to which people belonging to our generation had no reply. Our general knowledge was woefully poor in history or geography or science. They were taught as 'B Group' subjects, which is an euphemism for not teaching them at all. That was the difficulty that was sought to be removed in the system that obtained after 1948 and to-day we are thinking of two core subjects and two electives. I must place before the House my very grave misapprehensions, in the light of the huge influx into these schools, and the backwardness and environmental hardship of most of our children about their capacity to study so many subjects and benefit by the crores of rupees that we are spending on education. It is a matter that calls for very careful planning. Therefore, I would like to urge that while we welcome the pattern in general and thank the Government for having made sure of the 11 year course before anybody leaves the school, the content of the curriculum should be a matter for discussion by experts at the academic level. I would not say that it is a matter for political decision—not even for decision at the legislature level. It is a matter for decision purely at the academic level. It should be referred to the Consulative Committee again with all the consequences that it may imply.

Thank you, Sir.

Dr. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise with a great deal of hesitation to participate in this debate for more than one reason. I was never connected with any high school and cannot, therefore, speak with that amount of knowledge with which naturally those who have connections with the high school can afford to speak. But there is one thing that I must claim. That is perhaps I am one of the oldest members here, who was very conversant with the very introduction of the S.S.L.C. course in 1911—a course that was then introduced by a great Director of Public Instruction. When this course was introduced, there was no limitation in regard to any subject. Also there was no such thing as an examination requirement to say that a person has passed or not passed. The S.S.L.C. books were there on which the record of the students was entered from the I Form to the VI Form, and then his record at the Public Examination. There was no question of compulsion. As soon as he finished his VI Form study, he was supposed to have completed his study in the school and he was given a certificate that he finished his school course. There was no question of eligibility for college course or eligibility for appointment in the State Public Services as there is at present in some States. That was the pattern till 1925. Well, then, many complaints were received that persons who had got two and three marks were admitted to colleges, that the principals were not in a position to withstand a certain amount of pressure and that therefore there was too much of dilution as to the class of students who ought to be admitted to the University class. I am saying all these because I was a member of the Syndcate of the

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [28th March 1963

University and I know the discussion that took place at the time. They said that there must be some system by which the University could assess the progress of the candidate taking all these into consideration and then declare him eligible or otherwise. I do not want to go into all these details. But it is a fact that on some occasions, 25 per cent marks was considered sufficient. In some subjects 35 per cent marks was considered sufficient. In the languages 35 per cent marks was considered sufficient. There was moderation which enabled students to go as low as 30 per cent in languages and as low as 20 per cent or even less in some of the subjects concerned. I would like that to be clearly realised that examinations as such have very little importance in shaping the life of the boy, that the boy was not supposed to attend his classes only because he had the threat of an examination and that the teacher had a great deal to do in the shaping of the boy's life. Perhaps to-day as circumstances are and as teachers are, it may
5-20 p.m not be possible for them to control the bulk of the students who are admitted under all sorts of conditions. I entirely realise the difficulties of the teachers. But, at the same time, when they do emphasize examination as the most vital part of the student's preparation, whether it be in life or otherwise, I venture to submit that they may have to take a more realistic view because if a student gets 75 per cent in a subject, it cannot be said that he has mastered the subject and is in a position to enter life. In fact, the former Chairman of the University Grants Commission said that it was somewhat anomalous that anybody should get a III class which meant that he was not fit in 66 per cent but only in 33 per cent. We have tried to see whether the passes cannot be limited to those who get a higher percentage.

Coming to a few points, I am sorry I am one of those involved in many of these things, having been on the various Commissions. I was a member of the University Commission under Dr. Radhakrishnan. I was a member of the Secondary Education Comission. I was a member also of the committee that was appointed by this House, and I was a member of the Legislature when the former Ministry discussed that question. The main reason why I feel that the schools will not be in a position to take up the higher secondary level is that to-day there are 1,800 schools. When I say 1,800 schools, it is a very imperfect idea of the number of schools. There are divisions. In some schools there are eleven to twelve divisions. In other words, it is a multi-lateral school of twelve schools amalgamated into one school. There are other schools which have got six, seven or four divisions. Taking the average, therefore, I would not be incorrect when I say that if there are 1,800 schools, there are really 6,000 to 7,000 schools. Now, when we consider this particular point which was non-existent in 1953, when we thought of the higher secondary course, there were only 840 schools, and even if there were two or three divisions, there could not be more than 800 or 900 schools. Yet, if the scheme of the higher secondary education had been taken note of and implemented immediately, there would have been no difficulty and we would have been gradually brought up to that stage now. To-day,

28th March 1963] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

however, it is impossible to get these schools in any degree converted into higher secondary schools, because I wish to state that one of the conditions that was emphasised was that for the higher secondary class there must be at least three teachers who had taken either the M.A. or M.Sc. degree. Now, if you take that into consideration, there are very few schools which can afford to have these M.A.'s and M.Sc.'s. I do not say that there are not some such schools. In fact, it was with that view that the University gave certain specific concessions to teachers for qualifying themselves. They could appear in humanities without undergoing any course. But if they want to qualify in science, only if they spend a year in the University or get a certificate, they can appear for the M.Sc. examination. That disposes of the problem of how to convert all these schools into higher secondary schools. I am not anxious that the University should control the standards which ought to be the concern of the high schools. But as a practical proposition, facing facts as they are, with the enormous increase in the number of schools—I think the Director said that the increase would be 100 or 200 every year—we have to realise that the more you get schools in the rural areas, the more you have to cater to them in the high school stage and the pressure will be so great that no democratic element can afford to resist it. If that is the case, what is the remedy? I am not suggesting that the pre-University is the remedy. The University is already feeling the pinch of it. But for the fact that philanthropic citizens have come forward to comply with the conditions that have been laid down, it would not have been possible for us to contemplate with any degree of ease the number of students that would have to be enrolled in the pre-University class. Not only that. The University has taken the view, and in my opinion rightly, to dilute that standard to the high school level. Unless therefore the college becomes one equipped with senior Professors who can take part in the pre-University teaching, the instruction imparted in the pre-University class will not suffice. Although it is not possible, the rule is that within a period of three to five years the pre-University should be upgraded to the degree standard. I do not know how long this strain will continue. However, various courses have been given to those who pass the high school level in regard to technological subjects. Various subjects connected with the Secretarial course are taught. With regard to certain of these technical courses, we hope by and large that the students will be given the practical training that they should have for the particular branches in which they seek knowledge or employment.

5-30 p.m.

Then, much has been said about the 11-year course. For the last 150 years, as far as human visions can go backward, this State had a 11-year course. For what reason it was reduced to a 10-year course I cannot say. I certainly was not one of those who felt happier than to hear the views of those connected with education which do not genearlly find favour on a political platform. The reason why it was a 11-year course is this. Our students get into school at the age of 5 and 5 *plus*. It is good that they get in at that stage. The kindergarten school has hardly taken

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [28th March 1963

shape in this State and it is not likely to do so. Therefore it is we had to send our pupils to school at the age of 5 and 5 *plus*. It is pedagogically unsound at that early stage to compress a large number of subjects and force them to gain knowledge in those subjects. Even a few subjects well taught and well learnt are much better than a large number of subjects. Therefore it is that I was always of the opinion that it was not correct to change the 11-year course in our State because Bengal had a 10-year course. I may also add that not all Northern Indian States have got a 10-year course. There are States which have got a 11-year course. Therefore, it is not correct to say that every State has got a 10-year course. I may give a little insight into the controversy about the 10 or 11- year course. The Secretary of the Education Department at that time was a Bengalee and therefore he did not want the Bengalee students to put in 12 years of study. So, he pleaded very strongly that we should leave it as it was. We did not want to change the pattern as it was there. So it is in the Secondary Education Commission Report you find that we may have a 11 or 10-year course.

Coming to the subjects themselves, there has been some criticism as to what is to be learnt and what is
5-30 p.m. not to be learnt. I have heard with great respect the representative of the teachers speaking about the sad plight of those students who do not learn history and geography. I do not think any of us suggested that there should not be history and geography. History and Geography can be learnt very well so long as the teacher is in a position to give them the necessary impetus for their learning. In fact, it is not the pleasure of the teachers in the schools that made the University realise that social studies is a misnomer so far as we are concerned. Long before the separation of history and geography was contemplated the University insisted that in the B.T. course they are to be treated as separate subjects. History is a separate subject. Georgraphy is a separate subject. Although a great deal of pressure was brought on the University to allow anybody to teach geography whatever knowledge he might possess, we insisted that anybody who has not taken geography either for the old Intermediate standard or as an ancillary for the degree course or has not obtained a diploma in geography given by the University should not be in a position to teach the subject. I cannot understand a teacher teaching a subject without knowing the subject. But that is a different matter for higher authorities in the pedagogic line to consider. For the same reason we said that in respect of chemistry, physics and biology, teachers cannot teach without their knowing the subjects themselves.

I know history is a very interesting subject. But how do we teach it? We teach it from the I standard repeating the old story year after year. In our days in the preliminary stages we were taught geography of the district. In the middle stages we were taught a litttle more. In the high school stage, we were taught the geography of the State. But geography as a special subject is entirely different. So is history. But now the same things in

28th March 1963] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

repeated at all stages and the poor student begins with the history of the Vedic period and ends with the latest Presidential election in our country. That is not teaching history. It is cramming a subject to the unfortunate students. In the scheme that has been placed before us it has not been stated that history and geography should not be studied. As a matter of fact, they are put down as elective subjects which could be taught. We must make the students realise what it is and make them take an interest. After all many headmasters used to say : ' Boys, you can learn history yourselves. It is only a story. Why do you want me to teach? ' And they never taught history. And I do not think we were much worse for that. These are to be taught in the IX and X standards and there is to be no examination in them. But I must tell you there is a difference between those subjects which are to be continued and those subjects which may just do as informative subjects on which you can build your knowledge later on.

Sir, mention was made about the compulsory subjects. To-day without science in every aspect, neither the rural population nor the urban population can get on. A boy goes and presses the electric button and gets a shock. He ought to know something of science and something of the reason for that. As a matter of fact, in the earlier classes itself there is a certain amount of rudimentary science that is being taught. I am not speaking of those subjects which have been given up like hygiene and things like that. The reason why some of us felt that besides mathematics, physical sciences should be included was because of the enormous importance of physical sciences to-day. Nobody whether he is a rural or an urban dweller can afford not to know something of science. Rural electrification has been done all over the State. And electricity is one thing that makes the boy inquisitive of science. That is why we felt that both mathematics and science should be compulsory subjects. These two becoming compulsory subjects, what are the subjects that should be optional? A list of optional subjects is given. Anybody can take anything.

So far as the University studies are concerned, humanities may be taken. There is no objection to any student who has finished his school course to take up two humanities subjects because we feel that the general knowledge that he has gained is quite sufficient for him to pursue those studies. But that is not so when you come to mathematics or physical sciences. He cannot possibly do it unless he has had some basic knowledge of those subjects. If he wants to improve on that, it is open to him to take mathematics and if he has a flair for the physical sciences or any other subject in the long list, he can choose them. So far as these subjects are concerned they are only subjects for choice. And when I say subjects of choice, it will be for the parent and the headmaster to choose and not for the students to choose.

Sir, there is an excellent chapter in this book (the Secondary Education Commission report) which has been buried in the archives of the Secretariat where we have specifically given guidance as to what to do because not all the parents are able to give the

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [28th March 1963

necessary guidance at that stage. That apart, I do not think anybody will suffer in general knowledge or in his ability to pursue knowledge if the agreed principles on which the system is based are adopted. After all is said and done, how many of us because of our knowledge go in for these? Books come later on. We are all the time learning. I do not think any one of us can say that we stop with our school education. We follow up our education right through our lives. Likewise our boys should be given an impetus.

There is another point that I should like to make and that has been referred to in the scheme, namely, that in the case of all students the University should not be the only criterion. I fully appreciate that. In fact, we do not want that the University should be the only opening. We want a generalised education. At every stage there must be an opportunity for the boys to pursue their talents, to take to such courses as are suitable for their talents. That is why at the end of the VIII standard the student has got an opportunity to take to technical education, take to various and diverse occupations combined with some special subject which will improve his general knowledge. Then at the S.S.L.C. stage there are a number of alternatives open to him. One of these is the academic course. Now it is not that everybody that gets the B.A. or B.Sc. is going to compete for the I.A.S. or I.P.S. or any of those competitive examinations. And, therefore, with reference to the remarks made by the hon. Member Sri Rajah Iyer, I should say that the total number of students that appear for these competitive examinations is infinitely small. But I do want them to have this ideal before them that they can compete for these examinations also. Although under this scheme, their age will be more still, there are two chances for them to appear for the competitive examination. They will not by any means suffer on account of the age-limit.

Now, Sir, the introduction of English at the III standard, in my opinion, is a welcome feature. There is no use indulging in slogans. I can also write a book and repeat every sentence that mother-tongue should be the language from the primary school to the highest level, the Ph. D. level. It is good that we keep that in mind but as practical men who have got to see that our children and grandchildren have education and have opportunities of education, what is the position to-day? Let me tell you that so far as this State is concerned, there are very few opportunities such as are available to people in other parts of India to pursue vocations which will give them if not prestige at least monetary values. There are very few opportunities and that is why even now most of our people go out. I have seen many of them in Bombay, in Delhi, in Calcutta, in Nagpur, in Allahabad, in Lahore and so on. What are they to do? They are there by virtue of a little knowledge of English as typists, as shorthand writers. If the Lok Sabha wants shorthand writers, it has to indent on Madras. If there is a big conference, it has to indent on Madras shorthand writers. By that I do not mean that we should not have better opportunities. All that I wish to say is that English has been a

28th March 1963] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

very valuable asset to the people of this State. It should continue to be so for some time longer. Therefore, I welcome the introduction of English in the III standard. It ought not to be left to individuals to decide as they think simply because they have political power. Sir, in Bombay one Chief Minister said he should not have English except from the VIII standard. Only four years are enough to give them the English language. At the same time, some of these people see to it that their children are better educated in English (Laughter). I am one of those who feel that the education that my grandchildren should get should be the same as any other child would get. Otherwise, I am not true to myself. Therefore it is I welcome the introduction of English at the III standard not because we have a great deal of fetish for English. To-day and for the next so many years, we cannot help studying in English many subjects. Sir, I had been to International Conferences where 80 per cent of the people spoke only in English. The Germans, the Belgians, the people from the Netherlands, Norway and the Scandinavian countries and also people from the Middle East and some of the South African States make an impression, because they speak in English. We, from India, make a better impression because we speak in correct English (Laughter). Let me also say that. A great deal has been said about introducing regional language or the mother-tongue in the Universities. So far as the Madras University is concerned, there has been never any difficulty for the humanities. But, let me tell you my idea of an author. An author is one who does not indulge in plagiarism. I agree that all translations are plagiarisms. I want a man to be an author to write a book in Tamil from his own knowledge of economics, history, politics, logic or any other subject. When, therefore, we are asked in the University to select persons, we circularise to our professors Our professors, naturally, as respectors of certain conventions, say that they will write. That is why the Hon. Minister has had opportunities to find fault with them. That is why the Hon. the Leader of the Party has had opportunities to say that the two must go hand in hand. One cannot write a book by copying from other books. I can say that from my personal experience. Although the book which was discussed might have been written in English, I could not possibly take up this and that and make an example about it. Translations are hopeless because they get out of date very soon. The thing is to encourage those people to write in their own mother-tongue the subjects as authors and not as translators. Even then it was not insisted upon, because we felt that we would be misunderstood. People like me will be called merely—what shall I say—I shall leave it by an expression that has to be given to such old fashioned fogies. Whatever it may be, Sir, these have been our difficulties.

5-40 p.m.

There is one thing I want to say. In the degree classes there is no such thing as a text-book. If you will kindly look into the University class, you will find books of reference—four or five. A few of these books of reference have to guide the students with the help of the teacher. We are hoping that more books will be produced. We are hoping that possibly more authors will come for-

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [28th March 1963

ward to write these books. If we go to any college library and take up any subject of study for the degree standard and see the number of books available there and also the number of books that are yet to be produced in the regional language or mother-tongue that will prove a great eye-opener for millions. But I am not stressing this only. The subject to be taught and learnt properly is now coming more and more to be taught through journals and not through any books of reference. Journals are producing the latest information in every subject—politics, humanities and economics in particular. When I was told that economics would be taught in the mother-tongue, frankly I must confess, Sir, that I felt a little distressed. Economics is not merely adding two and two and saying that the total is four. In fact, the whole subject of economics is now under scrutiny, in the University and we are hoping to revise it. All that I say is that there should be no misunderstanding on the part of the teachers of the regional language or the mother-tongue, if one were to say that conditions must be satisfactory for the teaching of the subject in the mother-tongue. That is why at a Conference which was held three years ago, the Vice-Chancellors of the seven Universities in the Southern Region met and decided on certain broad principles. They did not wish it to be understood that they were anti-regional language, much less anti-mother-tongue. Some of them were excellent people in their own mother-tongue. They said that books in the regional language or the mother-tongue must be made available. There must be a sufficient number of reference books. The teacher himself must be in a position to teach in that particular subject and it has to be taught at the degree class. The staff appointed for the purpose must be separate, because they will have the same hours for teaching. If a college wants to have only one medium in a particular subject, it is welcome to do so. But, if it wants to have that medium and the English medium, that is also allowed. So, there has been no sort of impediment to the teaching of these subjects.

One thing more I would like to say. It is because of the predominant importance that was given to the mother-tongue, which I know was neglected before, that a radical change was made in regard to the degree courses. To-day both in the B.A. and B.Sc. classes, Part I is the mother-tongue or the regional language. The extent to which this language is being studied and taught would be an eye-opener to those who were reading Part II. In the old days, there was no Part II for the B.Sc. But now the University insisted on it. Why? If the students in the B.Sc. also knew that they should have a good knowledge of the regional language, they may in course of time be tempted to write books in the regional language in all subjects including science. In any case, they would be able to write a large number of popular books in the science subjects. Now we have no hesitation in saying that these reforms must be evolutionary and not revolutionary. That is the chief point I would like to state. The revolution in education always means a whole generation of boys left in the background. Think of them not in the sense of any political ideologies, good as they may be. Think of these poor boys. What do we find and hear? I would

28th March 1963] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

like to request the hon. Members to study the question posed to-day. In Standards II, III and IV are given text books in Tamil, for studying which a private tutor has to come and coach the students for two hours a day for one lesson. Personally, I would request all those who have got a Ph.D. in Tamil, not to indulge in difficult Tamil for Tamil books. The simple Tamil which will help for an appreciation of the language is not there. I know in those days—I will not mention names for obvious reasons—there were great scholars. I do not think that their names will go unheeded. Even to-day they write such simple books gradually from standard to standard and that brings me to the position that it is not easy to write a book or to write a book for a particular standard, whether it is VIII Standard or IX or X. We have to make up a good lot of leeway in getting these things.

Sir, I will only conclude by saying that the object of all educational reforms should be to get students to take an interest in the subjects and to get a certain amount of efficiency. Efficiency is impossible unless we have got three conditions. First of all, the teacher must be efficient and devoted to his task. Secondly, the number of students that is allotted to him must be reasonable. To get 60 students or 55 students and to have a dozen sections in a school may probably give excellent statistical results as to the number of persons in that class. In practice, it does nothing. All the more wastage is there in one form or another. Accustomed to a class of 12 in the IV Form, that wastage in V Form and then in the VI Form is more. I know every teacher in the old days knew what his student was capable of and could give him directions. It has been stated that as a result of introducing science subjects, the rural population will not have opportunities. So far as the compulsory subjects are concerned, it is not contemplated that the boys themselves will do any experiment. The teacher will have to demonstrate those experiments. There is no difficulty in every school being provided with this demonstration apparatus to make the students know what is frictional electricity, what is a cell, what are the physical laws of nature, etc. It is only for the optional subjects that we require equipment and the position can be gradually improved. I do not think these two arguments will be repeated too often that we have no equipment or that we have no qualified teachers. I am glad that steps are being taken to see that the so-called primary school teachers with their wonderful training after passing III Form are replaced by Secondary grade teachers. Although at present we do feel that the S.S.L.C. passed candidate may do some teaching, I hope in course of time—as some Friend said that in course of time everything should be in the regional language or the mother-tongue—we will think of education as one which we should encourage only if graduates are available for all the six classes in the school course, from the Sixth Standard right up to the Eleventh Standard.

I do not know why the old system may not be better where a single teacher was able to teach all the subjects except the language. Even there the language should not be allowed to be taught by others; although we may have B.A.'s and B.Sc.'s, I do

(Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [28th March 1963

not want them to teach the second language. Educational problems are always mixed up with two things. One of them is the question of the future of teachers which is a very important thing. That is not the only thing which the State should consider. Alternative methods of utilising their services must be found. If you want real improvement in the standards of teaching and the efficiency of the schools, we should go ahead and do it from now on by getting the equipment for the schools and gradually raising the standard. If in a limited sphere in the University we are able to get conditions which are not dissimilar between an urban college and a rural college, I do not see why within a peroid of time, at any rate, these schools should not be upgraded. I know it is a very difficult thing. As a matter of fact, we are now spending about Rs. 28 crores on education. It is a good slice. But I do feel that education is the best investment. We do not need a gold standard if you get good education. That is gold worth many times more than the smuggled gold that you get. I would say that the more you lay stress on quality in education the better.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will continue the discussion to-morrow. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p.m. to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

III.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* 176. *Notification issued with G.O. Press No. 439, Revenue, dated 30th January 1963, regarding exemption from the tax payable under the Madras General Sales Tax Act, 1959 (Madras Act I of 1959) of the sale of goods by any dealer to bona fide foreign tourists.*

* 177. *Notification issued with G.O. Press No. 494, Revenue, dated 4th February 1963, exempting the Khadi Department of the Madras State Khadi and Village Industries Board from the tax payable under the Madras General Sales Tax Act in respect of the purchases of coton made for distribution to the spinners atached to the Khadi Department and for supply to the Education Department.*

* 178. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 141, Industries, Labour and Co-operation (Labour), dated 8th January 1963, regarding amendment to the Madras Industrial Establishments (National and Festival Holidays) Rules, 1959.*

† 179. *Short review of the activities of Departments under the administrative control of Home Department for the half-year ending 30th June 1962.*

* 180. *Pamphlet on 'Housing' in Madras State, 1962–63.*

† 181. *Report on the activities of the Medical and Public Health Departments for the half year ended 30th June 1962.*

* Laid on the table of the House on 25th March 1963.
† Kept in the library for perusal by Members.